THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XII MARCH, 1926 No. 69

EDITORIAL

"Whereof this Ring given and received is a token and pledge": the words might well be used of the ring given by the dying Cardinal Mercier to Lord Halifax, and of the hopes and prayers thus symbolized and sealed. It is easy to forget the part played by acts of signal imagination in the making of history; yet examples are abundant. How much of history, for instance, is summed up in Canossa, how much again in Wittenberg—the last, indeed, the inevitable outcome of the first, working itself out through many vicissitudes of fortune. And now an act not less impressive than those associated with the Emperor's humiliation or Luther's defiance comes to mark the turning of a great tide in human affairs. Just as centuries elapsed between the Pope's proud claim and the Reformation, so it may be centuries before the Church gathers the fruits of the movement which found such spontaneous and affectionate expression at the death-bed of the Belgian Cardinal. But if we believe that there is no stronger power in the world than love, we cannot doubt that that day will come. Theologians and statesmen must meanwhile say their say and strive to formulate the principles and methods of Re-union. Yet in the last resort the determining factor will be the increase of charity. That is God's last card, and we do not know when He will play it. We only know that it will mean a Cross and a Resurrection.

PSYCHOLOGY AND SOME ASPECTS OF CATHOLICISM

THE present article will be concerned with two kinds of problem. First, with the problem of what account psychology can give of religion itself, and of how far (if at all) psychological considerations can be urged in justification of the attitude of religious faith. Secondly, we shall concern ourselves with the psychological problems of the particular kind of religious attitude found in the Catholicism of the English Church.

First, we must try to understand the psychological nature of the religious attitude itself. The mental attitude most strongly contrasted with religious faith is that of living only in the present—responding to present situations, without reflection on the future or the past, and without any feeling of a need for a theory of the process of life and of the world as a whole. Somewhere in the course of evolution to the fully self-conscious and reflective modern man, this unreflective attitude has become impossible. It can no longer satisfy one who has become acutely conscious of the fact that all his present activity will end in death and bodily decay, and has begun to feel that no pleasure or satisfaction in the present can be tolerable to him unless he can fit everything into an ordered scheme of the world as a whole.

The alternative to this unreflecting absorption in the present is the more or less conscious adoption of some attitude (or mode of adjustment) towards the World-process as a whole. The various religions of men form one class of these attitudes, although not all attitudes towards the World can properly be called religions. The attitude adopted may be one of angry rebellion, or of a passive and resigned acceptance of the universality of transitoriness and sorrow coupled with a determination to follow the path of right conduct.* Neither of these modes of adjustment, however, is religious. The essential character of the religious mode of adjustment is that it is organized round a system of beliefs with a belief in God (or in gods) as its central point, so that its emotional attitude is one of acceptance of the World-process and not of rebellion or even of mere acquiescence.

In order to give an adequate psychological description of the religious mode of adjustment, it is necessary to bear in

* As, for example, in the mode of adjustment towards the world taught by the Buddha, and, in a more modern form, by Mr. Bertrand Russell in his essay on *A Free Man's Worship*.

mind that, in all its forms, it is made up of three elements which are so essentially bound together in an organic whole that we cannot without a certain amount of falsification consider them separately. These are: (1) a system of beliefs; (2) a system of feeling tendencies; and (3) a system of modes of behaviour. Since our particular concern at present is not with religion in general, but only with one form of religion—that of Catholic Christianity as it exists in the English Church—we will content ourselves with indicating briefly the nature of these three elements in this one form of religion.

1. The system of beliefs with which we are here concerned is mainly that enshrined in the teaching of Our Lord and in the traditional dogma of the Catholic Church. It has as its most essential elements the statement of the existence of a personal Triune God, of His Incarnation at a particular time in history, of His relationship of Father to human beings, of His contact with them in various ways, but particularly through the sacraments, of the reality of human responsibility, and of the survival of human personality after bodily death.

2. Its ways of feeling are those belonging to the Christian's sentiments for God, for His Church, and for the moral requirements of the Christian religion. These feelings include the distinctively religious emotion of awe which is felt at the thought of God and before His sacramental presence, and the feeling of dependence and human littleness which has sometimes been considered to be the characteristic emotion of the religious attitude. On the moral side, the religious ways of feeling comprise the emotions of shame which make up the attitude of penitence.

3. The religious modes of behaviour are those connected with prayer, with participation in the sacraments, and with moral behaviour (so far as the motive for this comes from within the religious sentiment).

The interdependence of these elements in the religious mode of adjustment is an elementary fact of the psychology of religion. Religious dogma has not only a reference to fact, but it also indicates to the believer ways of feeling and of behaving. The doctrine of the Real Presence means not only a fact of presence not susceptible to direct empirical investigation, but it means also that the believer feels before the sacrament the emotions which would be appropriate if Christ Himself were there, and that he behaves as if he were in that Presence. The doctrine of the Fatherhood of God means not only that there is a relationship between God and human beings less inadequately expressed when we speak of God as our Father than in any other way, but also that the emotions felt by a son towards his father

and filial behaviour are the appropriate emotions and behaviour for the believer to adopt towards God. It is, indeed, a general rule that the facts to which religious dogma refers are not facts of either actual or possible sensory experience, and are not therefore the objects of possible direct proof or disproof by empirical methods. Nor can we suppose that human language, largely evolved to deal with a physical environment, can adequately refer to such facts.

It is because the fact-reference of religious dogma is to things beyond perceptual knowledge, while its emotional and behaviour implications are clear and familiar, that the purely intellectual approach to religious dogma (as traditionally adopted by the philosophers of religion) tends to be a barren one. As a reaction against this barrenness we find Professor le Roy insisting that the real meaning of a dogma is its emotional and behaviour implication.* While, indeed, Professor le Roy does not deny the fact-reference of dogma, he does speak of its behaviour implication as its meaning "before all" and as "its positive signification." This seems to be an exaggeration which contains the germs of a subjectivism at which we cannot be surprised that le Roy's co-religionists were alarmed. The truer statement would seem to be that in addition to its fact-reference a religious dogma has emotional and behaviour implications which may sometimes be more easily dealt with by thought than the fact-reference (because nearer to experience and accessible to observation), but which have no claim to be more important than the fact-reference.

It is in its possession of these implications for religious feeling and behaviour that religious dogma differs from other bodies of belief. In its fact-reference, however, it is clear that religious dogma (if true) must be consistent with all other kinds of true knowledge (such as that of science). There remains the distinction between these kinds of knowledge that religious dogma refers to facts of importance for our emotional and practical adjustment towards the world as a whole, while the doctrines of science have relatively little significance for this adjustment. A further basis for division between the doctrines of religion and science is provided by the fact that (unfortunately as it may seem to the scientist) the former are not primarily products of the application of the inductive method to the data of

* "Un dogme a surtout un sens *pratique*. Il énonce avant tout une *prescripiion d'ordre pratique*. Il est plus que tout la formule d'une *règle de conduite pratique*. Là est sa principale valeur, là sa signification positive. Cela ne veut point dire d'ailleurs qu'il soit sans rapport avec la pensée, car: 1° il y a aussi des devoirs concernant l'action de penser: 2° il est affirmé implicitement par le dogme lui-même que la réalité contient (sous une forme ou sous une autre) de quoi justifier comme raisonable et salutaire la conduite prescrite" (p. 25). *Dogme et Critique*, Professor Éd. le Roy, Paris, 1907.

experience and cannot to any very great extent be justified by the inductive method.

It is, of course, true that the stability of the religious system of an individual is seriously endangered if it is burdened with such a doctrine of the infallibility of the authorities for his body of belief that he is unable to make adjustments even in the minor points of his belief to the demands of his extra-dogmatic knowledge. Much of the English Christianity of the beginning of the last century was burdened in this way, and the instability which resulted from the inflexibility of our grandparents' acceptance of the literal accuracy of Jewish legends of the creation of the World has had effects from which English religion is still in process of recovery. It is clear that the educated, clear-thinking man can only find a satisfactory World-adjustment in a religion whose dogmas are not inconsistent with all the knowledge he has obtained from other sources. In other words, his adjustment must be made round the whole body of his beliefs, and not only those which come to him with the authority of the religious body to which he belongs. Similarly his acceptance of the authority of religious dogma must take place with full consideration of the bearing of historical research and literary criticism on the force of that authority.

This work of making different bodies of belief coherent by mutual adjustment is one which tends to take place more or less automatically in every rational mind. Mutual adjustment may indeed take place too easily. The capacity to hold beliefs tentatively, with due regard to the uncertainty of hypotheses and the inadequacy of language, is the product of scientific knowledge and of reflection rather than a primitive endowment of the uneducated mind. In any case, the task of making the fact-references of religious dogma consistent with the fact-references of scientific hypotheses must not be regarded as the principal work of religious thinkers. The verifiability of scientific facts does not prevent the conclusions drawn from them from being generally without important implications for religious feeling and behaviour.* Particular statements which were at one time accepted as religious dogma (such as that of special creation) have been generally rejected as they have been perceived to be inconsistent with a well-attested scientific hypothesis, but no profound change in religious feeling or behaviour results from a change in belief about these particular statements.

On the other hand, an acceptance of a belief in determinism,

* Those best acquainted with scientific research will best appreciate, moreover, the uncertainty of scientific hypotheses, the difficulty of attaining complete consistency between the different special sciences, and the danger of an attempt to force a premature consistency on to the hypotheses of two sciences (as, for example, physiology and psychology).

of the unreality of human responsibility, or in the cessation of personal existence after death, would have such important emotional and behaviour implications that they would threaten to overthrow the religious attitude altogether. These, however, are not well-attested results of scientific research. They are parts of the dogma of an irreligious mode of world-adaptation, a dogma with no more direct inductive basis than the dogmas of religion itself.

The least uncertain elements in scientific belief have little direct bearing on religious dogma. Those who feverishly demand "restatement," because of the alleged inconsistency of religious dogmas with the point of view of modern science, seem to be wrong in thinking that any religious object of importance would be attained by the kind of restatement they demand, even if our knowledge of science were complete enough to render it possible. A more careful thinking out of the correct attitude towards religious dogma would often be a more useful employment of intellectual energy than a premature restatement.

What contribution can the psychological method of study make to the problem of the justification of the religious attitude? This justification must necessarily have as its principal part the showing that the system of beliefs which constitute religious dogma are true (*i.e.*, that the facts and objects to which they refer are real). The contribution of psychology itself to the elucidation of this problem must necessarily be a small one. It cannot be too often repeated that the mere psychological examination of a belief cannot tell us whether that belief is true or false. We cannot find out the nature of reality by examining beliefs. We may show to what extent a belief is produced by auto-suggestion or, that is, a wish-fulfilment, but these may be properties of either a true belief or a false one.*

We cannot, therefore, disprove the reality of religious objects (as psychologists are alleged to do by theologians) merely by saying that religious belief is the result of auto-suggestion. Equally futile are the ingenious verbal devices of their theological opponents to show that the psychologist who affirms this is involved in contradiction or scepticism. Auto-suggestion and hetero-suggestion undoubtedly play a part in building up every person's religious belief. They would do so whether that belief were true or false, and, so far as a belief is founded on any kind of suggestion, it is founded on something

* We can, of course, show whether the belief of an individual is well or ill-founded, and that may give us some guidance in judging the evidential value of particular persons' beliefs, but it will not carry us very far in our knowledge of whether the beliefs are true or false. The fact, for example, that most people who believe in ghosts do so for totally inadequate reasons does not in itself disprove the reality of spiritualist phenomena.

which has no relation to its truth or falsity. In order to find out, so far as we can, whether religious belief is true or false, we must examine its rational and not its psychological foundations.

The fact that the religious attitude proves an adaptive one—*i.e.*, that a man accepting the religious attitude towards the world is better adapted to his environment as a whole—is (if this can be demonstrated) an important reason for believing that that attitude is founded on an insight into the nature of reality. It would, however, be a poor reason for maintaining the truth of religious belief if it stood alone.

It seems, however, to be clear that the empirical justification of religious belief is not so impossible as many philosophers of religion seem to suppose. The danger of the empirical method is that we may be tempted to try to found an empirical argument on too narrow a foundation. A reality which has effects in the phenomenal world can be inferred from a study of those effects. I have maintained elsewhere* that the only valid empirical argument for the truth of religious belief is its power to rationalize (*i.e.*, to give a coherent, intelligible, and reasonably simple account of) the whole of experience. This experience must include, however, not only those data of religious experience which are studied in psychology, but also the knowledge of the world we obtain from physics, biology, human anatomy, etc. Paley was right in using the facts of biology as an argument for the existence of God, and wrong only because his facts were incomplete (since they included only one side of the case), and because he supposed that this source could supply an argument capable of standing alone.

In his highly valuable study of the religious consciousness, Professor Otto seems to believe that the reality of God can be inferred directly and solely from the consideration of the nature of the emotional experiences which he calls *numinous*.† This seems to be a reversion to the old belief that psychological data alone can be evidence of the reality of religious objects. Taken in conjunction with all other evidence on the subject, the nature of the numinous experiences will provide a very striking argument for the reality of religious objects if they are found on the whole to point in the same direction as other modes of experience. But were there no other reason for believing in God than that supplied by the religious emotions, the acceptance of His reality might be an attitude justified by faith, but its intellectual support would be very weak.

We have so far discussed only the contribution of psychological thought to the central religious belief—the belief in a

* *An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion*, Cambridge, 1923.

† *The Idea of the Holy*, Professor R. Otto (English trans.), Oxford, 1923.

personal God. There is also a belief important in its effects on conduct which modern psychology is supposed to undermine—the belief in the reality of human responsibility. The fact that psychology as a science is engaged in trying to find causes for all mental events means that it is adopting psychological determinism as a principle of investigation. This does not mean, however, that psychologists are committed to the acceptance of a statement of determinism which would make responsibility illusory. The act of choice in a volitional action may be an event *sui generis*, and not reducible to the mechanical formula of a stronger impulse overcoming a weaker one.

Psychologists do indeed sometimes use such a mechanical formula. Thus Professor Titchener says that in a volitional action the strongest impulse always wins, although he is careful to add that it is not always the impulse which appears the strongest to introspection.* Professor McDougall (in his *Social Psychology*, but not in his later *Outlines of Psychology*) similarly says that in volitional action an impulse from the self-regarding-sentiment is added to the weaker impulse in a conflict, and that by this addition the weaker impulse is so strengthened that it outweighs the impulse which was originally the stronger.

Both of these formulations of what happens when we make a voluntary choice between two impulses are alike open to the objection that they explain the choice by a mechanical analogy which is entirely unwarranted. If the voluntarily selected impulse does not appear the stronger to introspection, and if (as is in fact often the case) we have no ground for calling it the stronger impulse except the fact that it is the one which finally finds expression in conduct, then the formula "the stronger impulse always wins" is merely a disguised tautology. It may be reduced to the form: "in a volitional choice between two impulses the impulse which wins always wins"—a proposition which clearly throws no light on the nature of volition or on the reality of responsibility. The psychologists who rashly denies the reality of human responsibility or who incautiously lays the foundation for such a denial by resorting to mechanical analogies in order to give an account of volition is in reality going beyond the legitimate deductions from his facts.

Our next problem is that of the aspects of Catholicism which present themselves to a psychologist. I do not propose to attempt to make a detailed discrimination between Anglo-Catholicism and other forms of Christianity, but to select three elements of the religion of the Catholic revival which are of particular interest to the psychologist. These three elements are: its Catholic allegiance (with a characteristically large

* *A Beginner's Psychology*, Professor G. B. Titchener, New York.

allowance for individual freedom), its ceremonial, and its sacramental system.

By its Catholic allegiance I mean that its members are taught to regard themselves as part of a social group wider than the English nation, one which comprises the whole body of the Catholic Church as existing at the present day and from the time of its foundation. On the side of belief this social consciousness is expressed by *orthodoxy—i.e.*, by the acceptance of traditional dogma as the body of belief around which the religious adjustment of each individual is built. By *ceremonial* I mean action of dramatic character in which there is expression of meaning in a non-verbal form. By *sacramentalism* I mean the use of religious behaviour which is not intended, like ceremonial, to convey meaning or to produce mental attitudes, but which is believed to provide a real method of approach to divine realities.

Requirements of space must prevent us from dealing with the psychological aspects of these factors with any fulness, but I propose to take each in turn and to indicate what appear to be the main points to be considered in connection with them.

First we must consider the Anglo-Catholic emphasis on allegiance to the body and traditions of the universal Church. It is a simple psychological fact that man is a gregarious animal, and that his opinions are largely fashioned for him by his social environment. An essentially false view of the psychology of religion is reached if we forget this fact; religion is largely (but not entirely) a social adjustment, and its dogmas are largely social beliefs. No doubt many of the leaders of rebellions against the Catholic tradition have had as their ideal the abandonment of any social intermediary between a man and his God, and the refusal to recognize any authority in matters of belief except the individual's own conscience. But the history of religious sects shows us that such rebellions are subject to the danger that they may end simply in the replacement of the large social group of the Catholic Church by the small social group of an isolated sect, and the replacement of a wider by a narrower tradition of belief.

The fact that something is lost by such replacement follows necessarily from that character of religious dogma in which it differs most essentially from scientific knowledge. The statements of religious dogma are not such as (even theoretically) the single religious believer could find out for himself. Their authority comes from their nature as a revelation which has been socially handed down, and as the crystallization of a body of experience of a great body of individuals. Of this experience a part, and a part only, can be repeated in the lifetime of any

single man who needs these dogmas as the belief-element in his mode of adjustment towards the world as a whole. Effectiveness of religious adjustment and not a high degree of originality in his religious opinions is the practical need of the man who would develop his religious life, and the abandonment of all socially given doctrines tends to result in ineffectiveness of religious adjustment.

It should hardly be necessary to emphasize further that the nearest approach to truth in religious belief is to be found in following the widest possible consensus of opinion amongst religious believers, and not by following exclusively the uncertain guidance of our own individual religious intuitions. A high degree of respect for and submission to orthodoxy is not therefore irrational or unintellectual, but is the mark of the sanest rationalism. But this argument does not lead so far as to require an unconditional submission to orthodoxy. While it is highly probable that the main body of orthodox dogma is far more right than would be any set of religious propositions a single individual evolved from his own experience and his own intuitions, particular errors may be enshrined in traditional dogmatic formulations. Freedom in thought as well as submission is necessary to make up a wholly satisfactory attitude towards traditional dogma.

If such "liberal orthodoxy" is the most reasonable attitude towards religious dogma, it is also the case that such freedom within Catholic submission is psychologically the most satisfactory attitude, for man has individual intellectualizing tendencies as well as gregarious ones. It is as truly doing violence to a man's nature to ask him to suppress these individual intellectualizing tendencies by unconditional submission to a socially imposed dogma as it is to deprive him of a social body of beliefs altogether. It is a happy result of the history of the Church of England that she can offer to her sons the richness of Catholic allegiance and orthodox dogma unhampered by any limitation of individual freedom through doctrines of oracular infallibility—papal, scriptural, or conciliar. Few doctrines have done more harm to religious believers than such assertions of infallibility (unwisely supposed to safeguard dogma) by driving them, through an easily understandable reaction, to scepticism or to one of those impoverished forms of religion in which the whole body of traditional belief is regarded as suspect.

The use of ceremonial—that is, of sensory and dramatic representations as conveyers of religious meaning—is again a feature of Catholicism for which we may claim psychological justification. If man, in developing processes of thinking in

words, had left entirely behind him his older habits of imaginal thinking, it is probable that he would find no value in ceremonial. It is because these imaginal and symbolic modes of thinking still persist, and because these tend particularly to be charged with emotional content, that the religion which abandons ceremonial is abandoning one way of reaching the thought and affections of its followers. It is probable that this loss is greater for the simple and uneducated than it is for those who have developed intellectual modes of thinking until they can serve nearly all functions in thought.* But even for the most intellectual there is definite loss in the abandonment of sensory representations. The mental elements most essential to religion are those with the greatest difficulty of expression by words. The apprehension of what Professor Otto calls the *numinous* is peculiarly difficult in verbal terms. The words *mysterium tremendum* convey weakly what is more effectively conveyed by cathedral vaultings, by sacred music and gestures, by vestments and incense.

Another important psychological function of symbolic and dramatic representation in religion is connected with the ease with which sentiments are formed round concrete objects and the difficulty with which they are formed round abstract conceptions and things distant from possibility of sensory apprehension. Clearly sentiments for objects remote from sense are of the greatest importance for religion—such sentiments as that of love and reverence for God Himself and for Jesus Christ, of reverence for holiness, and of hatred for sin. Many of the symbols of religious ceremonial are concrete objects round which these sentiments may be focussed. Such concrete focussing points for abstract sentiments are not peculiar to religion: the Union Jack is a similar focussing point for the sentiment of patriotism. Examples of concrete symbols in religious worship serving this function are numerous. The visible representations of Our Lord are the concrete objects which call out the emotions connected with Himself; the cross is the concrete embodiment of the virtues of humility and self-abnegation.

Such abstract sentiments formed on the basis of concrete objects may easily be mistaken by the superficial observer for sentiments for the concrete objects themselves.† That this is not the case is indicated by the symbol's significance for action.

* It must not be forgotten also that there are (as was pointed out by Galton) wide individual differences in imagery quite apart from differences in intellectual attainment. There will always, therefore, be differences in attitude towards ritual. The ceremony which conveys deep religious meaning to one man may seem trivial and meaningless to another, simply because they are of different imaginal types.

† No doubt they may become this, and we then have the mental attitude of "idolatry." The remedy for idolatry is not the abandonment of the concrete symbol, but the supplying to it of its lost religious significance.

The sentiment which a patriotic Englishman has formed round his flag leads him to self-sacrificing action on behalf of his country; if it did not we might justly suspect him of being an idolator of the flag. Similarly the religious man's sentiment for the concrete symbol of his devotion leads him to action, whose end is clearly not bounded by the symbol itself, but is concerned with the abstract or remote realities which are the real objects of his sentiment.

Sacramentalism presents a problem which must be kept sharply distinct from that of ceremonial. There is little that can be said of sacramentalism from the psychological point of view, and that little must be very largely a repetition of what has already been said on the psychological contribution to the more general problem of the reality of religious objects.

The sacrament is an element in religious behaviour which, unlike ceremonial, is not regarded by the believer as dependent for its action on its purely subjective effects on the minds of the persons participating in it. Baptism is, for example, regarded as a sacrament by some Christians, and as ceremonial by others. We shall not be here concerned with the theological discrimination between sacrament and ceremonial. From the psychological point of view, there is a clear difference between the attitudes of the worshippers towards them. It is the difference between our attitude towards an event which takes place in the external world and one which takes place in our own minds only. For our present purpose we may discriminate between these attitudes by calling them the objective and the subjective attitudes.*

It is, of course, true that it is not only in the Catholic tradition that the belief in a real external action accompanying the religious rite (which we have called " sacramentalism ") is found. Prayer is generally regarded as sacramental by the Evangelical who would regard the Lord's Supper as a rite whose benefits were essentially subjective. But a much greater extension of the field of the sacramental is characteristic of the Catholic as opposed to the Protestant tradition.

Whether the rites believed to be sacramental by the Catholic Christian are truly so, or whether their effects are to be explained subjectively, is a question to which psychology can have little to say. Like the question of the reality of the objects of religious belief, it is one on which psychological evidence can have little direct bearing. The sceptical psychologist's statement that these effects are due to auto-suggestion is no less irrelevant as evidence than the theologian's attempted demonstration that the acceptance of this statement would land us in complete

* Following Professor Pratt, *The Religious Consciousness*, New York, 1920.

scepticism. The difficulty is the same for the reality of communion in prayer as for the reality of regeneration in baptism.

It is true, indeed, that if sacramental action is real, this reality should be perceptible to experience, so that the material of a psychological study of religion must provide some sort of demonstration as to the effects of the sacramental life. Probably (as Professeur Maréchal suggests* for the reality of the source of the mystical experience) this reality is not demonstrable clearly in the life of a single participator in the sacraments, but may be seen by a wide survey of the effects of the sacraments as a whole on those who have participated in them. Those who believe in the sacraments believe generally that on such a wide survey of religious effects the sacraments are seen to be real means of grace.

I think that on psychological grounds we are justified in contending that these three elements (of Catholicity, use of ceremonial, and sacramentalism) are essential constituents of any religious adjustment which is to be wholly satisfactory to persons of all kinds and under all circumstances. Of course, these elements are not peculiar to any one form of religion, but neglect of them may be a source of weakness in otherwise satisfactory religious attitudes. The fundamental appeal of the Catholic tradition and of ceremonial is illustrated by the fact that many forms of Protestant Christianity which have started as a reaction against these things have, in the course of time, developed a ceremonial of their own and a new group consciousness with an appended rigid orthodoxy. These have been different in their details, but not in their essential nature from the ceremonial and the allegiance which were originally rejected. Often the founders of these bodies would regard their later developments as evidence of degeneration. It seems better to see in them an unavoidable expression of fundamental human needs. Nothing need be regretted about such developments, except the narrowness of the group-consciousness and the occasional triviality of the ceremonial which may result from the fact that they have been developed by a small group independently of the great body of Christian experience.

ROBERT H. THOULESS.

* *Études sur la Psychologie des Mystiques* (Tome premier), Paris, 1924.

WHAT WE BELIEVE ABOUT GOD

SUCH is the title of a paper read at the last Modern Churchman's Conference at Oxford by Rev. J. S. Bezzant, Vice-Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford. Our attention was first drawn to it by a compressed report in *The Times*, in which the negative conclusions were much more harshly stated than in the article published in *The Modern Churchman;* and not for the first time the public have received a warning: specially needed in the case of highly controversial subjects handled by non-expert reporters. As we now have it, the paper gives fairly clear indications of a certain attitude of mind which is loosely described as Modernist, though being a very familiar phenomenon in Church History.

Before pointing out some of these we venture on a preliminary remark as to our own point of view which in one respect is not very far removed from that of several members of the Conference, as given in the editorial notes at the beginning of the September number of the magazine.

The Modernist is aghast at the temper of the Traditionalist who clings to outworn formulæ which he either repeats without attempting to interpret them or explains to mean what they do not say. The remedy proposed for this evil is a restatement of dogma. Very often the Traditionalists are criticized without any specification of the points as to which the Church formulæ are " outworn "; and still less is there any agreed upon proposal as to a better form of words. But with the protest made by the Modernists, as far as we understand it, orthodox Christians may be in cordial sympathy, in so far as it is against preachers who have never given serious thought to the meaning of the great sacred expressions used in their discourses and reiterated till they become wearisome. Nothing weakens the hold on truth of ordinary people so effectually as doctrinal affirmations, whether made in the pulpit or elsewhere, which are dead: conveying no significance whatever to the hearer, and evidently not the mainspring of the speaker's conduct or life.

But a caution is required here. What is deplored by Modernists is not really the actual form of words used so much as the plain fact that the speaker has not tried to make them express a truth that is living to himself; so that it is often apparent that he does not in his heart attach any meaning to affirmations which have been authorized for nearly 2,000 years. It no less frequently happens that the words make no response whatever in the minds of the hearers (yet in rural districts it frequently happens that the sermons which are most praised are those which are least understood). So it comes about that the message fails,

and the failure is ascribed by Modernists to sluggish-minded Traditionalists. Now, of course, we all deplore failure, but is it confined to Traditionalists? Supposing Modernism made great strides in this country, and every preacher talked of Christ not as the Son of God, but as the "Crown of Evolution"; would the congregations have a firmer hold on the nearness of God? (Matt. iv. 17). We have heard of Newman in a sermon on the Passion of Christ pausing to say in his inimitable manner, "Now never forget that all this happened to the Son of God." We make bold to maintain that if the other formula had been used, the thrilling effect of the utterance would have been less, not more, no matter how educated the audience may have been, or how receptive of Science's last discovery.

With this preamble to show that we do not rely on mental deadness any more than the Modernists, we proceed to collect from the magazine certain indications of an attitude widely prevailing to-day; which may be briefly described as a vivid recognition of man's part in the Redemption of the world.

Such a description, however, requires a word of explanation, our object being to indicate to our fellow-Churchmen why we often find it difficult to walk in step with them up the slopes of the Narrow Way.

There is a permanent difficulty in interpreting History. Man is seen struggling upwards, as he believes, and choosing freely, often wrongly. Often, however, he can claim—or anyhow does claim—that he has acted rightly and "done good" thereby. Yet the moment he begins to plume himself on the result something goes wrong, and History gives a good hint of the reason why. Let us take as an instance two recorded events: the battle of Marathon and the rescue of the Hebrews from Egypt. They both excited an immense wonder, the latter being for centuries alluded to as a signal instance of God's intervention for the forwarding of His scheme for the salvation of man. Marathon was a stock theme of orators 150 years after it happened, but remained a much smaller fact for the Greeks than the Red Sea for the Israelites. This we suggest is because it is recorded with much less emphasis on the divine operation than is given in the Hebrew story.

Now we note that a deeply religious view of things means the ascription of the guidance of History to God, and yet the part played by man is not to be forgotten; indeed, it is amply recognized, whereas the Gentile historian is inclined to magnify the human work and hardly to mention the divine. This is a truism, but the point is that the Hebrew story has for 3,000 years maintained a place in History which may be called unique, except for certain others in Holy Writ. These others are written

still more decidedly from the divine side, so to speak; and our inference is that there is in the human mind a deep instinct which bids us welcome the pious ascription to God of the guidance of earthly events, though there is in most people a strong disposition to ascribe prosperity, progress, and security to man's forethought or to luck.

The tendency of Modernists is to reassert the dignity and importance of man, and in so far as the "orthodox" writers have erred on the other side, we may be grateful for the correction, though it happens to be one of those which require to be very delicately administered. For any Theist will acknowledge that while a statement which is one-sided in either direction is to be deplored, the ignoring of God's action is far more serious than the under-estimate of human prowess or skill.

It is in short a modern instance of the time-honoured difficulty of reconciling the subjective and the objective. This much, however, is clear. Our Lord certainly took the prophetic view of things which we find magnificently expressed in the Old Testament: to wit, that God is always engaged in saving mankind from themselves, and that the most heinous form of sin is the refusal to acknowledge His active Love: the refusal, in short, of gratitude for the Self-Revelation of the Eternal.

Moreover, if this statement holds good of historical events, it is equally true of the progress of human thought about God. Here, again, it is impossible to sever the connection between God and man any more than we can in the matter of the Incarnation. But hitherto it has been a very general habit to speak of great writers, poets, and artists as inspired men. The output of their minds sometimes called genius is more often called Inspiration: something which comes "from above," and yet for that very reason becomes wholly, entirely, and truly part of the inmost self, "the inner man."

Supposing, then, that in this very deep and intricate matter, which goes to the very root of the relation between God and His children, we find ourselves being impelled to discard the teaching of the Bible and the Church, and revert to a more pagan view of man's power to raise himself in the scale of Creation, we may remind each other that it is no light academic question which is at stake. For if it is true that the Eternal God has guided human affairs and human thought, if, moreover, to underestimate His action and teaching, however congenial to our pride, is none the less an appalling dishonour to the Father of us all, we may be excused if certain pronouncements of Modernists to-day fail to commend themselves to us at once. The truth is that in much of their published literature the tone is self-complacent. But self-complacency has been from the beginning

conspicuously absent from the utterances of all Christian Saints and Heroes; indeed, their achievements have been markedly proportionate to their "self-emptying" and their unwavering recognition of utter dependence upon God.

It will help our discussion if we take in connection with this statement the closing words of Professor Bethune-Baker's paper, adding to them an expression which has been quoted (not publicly) as proceeding from the same influential quarter. We give the first *in extenso*.

"Jesus Himself may be far less regarded to-day as the Saviour of mankind because none of the doctrines of the Fall of Man and Atonement and Heaven and Hell, which are generally known as Christian, are credible to-day. But His ideas and ideals as to the relations that ought to exist between man and man as a condition of human society are becoming socially effective as they never were while those doctrines reigned and the world was regarded as a perishing world disfigured by Man rather than as God's world, potentially and progressively, but only through man's free co-operation His perfect organ: the end to be as much Man's achievement as God's."

The remark we have heard quoted was: "We are as necessary to God as God is to us."

We are glad that the Professor has been thus outspoken, because he shows to what end the more misty utterances of some of his colleagues are tending. But his words, though lucid and strong, leave us bewildered, and wholly unable to reconcile them with the Confessio Fidei on p. 355. The first sentence quoted commits the Professor to a tremendous affirmation—viz., that all the doctrines about four vast subjects which occupy, roughly speaking, about one-third of Christ's recorded teaching, may be safely discarded, apparently because a number of our fellow-countrymen prefer that they should be. At least, no other reason is suggested. Now who is this whose solemn and terrific warnings as to our present life, as well as the fragmentary but radiant glimpses into the life of the Blessed hereafter, are contemptuously thrust into the limbo of outworn formulæ. If the teacher of those doctrines is anybody recognized by competent judges as great or good or wise or influential, this mutilation of the recorded teaching would be an arrogant proceeding indeed. But what are we to call it when the Professor himself describes the Teacher as follows: "I pause for a moment to emphasize the fact that Christian faith is in One who was at once both very Man of very Man and very God of very God." We prefer not to put into words what impression is left on our minds by these two passages taken together. We must, however, note in passing the significant past tense in the phrase, "Who *was* . . . very God . . ." etc.; as it assumes that at some unspecified time Christ either put off all (or some) of His Perfect

Manhood, *or* all or some of His Perfect Godhead. But the whole of the "living hope" given us by Christianity is bound up with the Divine Life being infused into ours now and for evermore. If the bridge over the chasm has been broken (in spite of Matt. xxviii. 20), we Christians "are of all men the most to be pitied." But the final words quoted above in the first passage indicate—so at least we read them—that in the writer's mind there is no *essential* difference of power between man and God. "Give man time, and he will redeem the Universe, and his part in the joint achievement will be equal to God's." We would fain believe the Professor meant nothing of the kind. But is it an unfair construction to put upon his words?

We notice next an admission. Christ's social teaching is coming to be effective; and the reason given is that four of the greatest doctrines taught by the Lord concerning our relation to God and our destiny in Eternity are set aside as being all incredible. Nothing, however, is said as to whether "incredible" is a synonym for "unpalatable." We live in days when the fear of suffering and sentimentality of religious belief are quite enough to account for the banishing from popular Christianity of all idea of the Majesty of God, and how to us His Children, steeped in ignorance, self-sufficiency, and spiritual slumber, He appeals by revealing not only His infinite Love, but His infinite Severity if the Love is rejected. Now, if there is any truth in this diagnosis, we cannot be expected to assent to the Professor's opinion that, *owing to this wholesale watering down of the Divine Self-Revelation*, Christ's "ideas and ideals are becoming socially effective."

Let us look facts in the face. Christ's social teaching to very many earnest and compassionate men is disappointingly scanty and unpractical. It is almost all comprised in the precept "Go and teach." Doubtless there is something said about loving one another, but that command throughout the New Testament is always based on the deeper doctrine that God is Love; and that is no scholastic dogma but the corollary from the *facts* of the Gospel interpreted as the action of our Saviour, Redeemer, and Judge. On the Revelation of our Creator's infinite concern for us the appeal for brotherliness is based; but for many millions of wayward and baffled seekers after Righteousness, an essential ingredient in that appeal is its terror. We men are desperately inclined to pick and choose out of God's Revelation what suits our temperament. The awfulness of the warning if we reject the overtures of Love is wholly uncongenial to most of us; so by way of easing the situation we whittle down the facts which speak with manifold and heavenly power of the Love, in the hope of diminishing the terrifying responsibility.

All this is very natural and to many very plausible: one objection, however, is that it cuts away the whole of the Christian hope by either ignoring or watering down the story of God's intervening to save "by love or fear." The hope is that more men will listen if they realize there is Judgment to come than if they are persuaded that the difference between Good and Evil is not eternal. Men are resourceful in disowning responsibility. Once persuade them that in the long run we shall all meet in Heaven at last, whether we prefer cold-heartedness to goodwill or not, and the chances of the Lord's ideals becoming "socially effective" are infinitely remote.

We do not wish to rail or scold, but to discuss in all friendliness, yet with all frankness; and we invite the Professor and those who think with him to consider if they are not busily engaged in eviscerating the Gospel till all that is left is not Good News at all, but a few tiny fragments of moral exhortation mostly inapplicable to modern life and all incredibly difficult. Professor Jacks, who is not an ecclesiastical obscurantist, has said quite truly that the modern belief in moral exhortation is a prevalent and deadly superstition.

One more suggestion. As has before now been remarked, Jesus must have struck the Jews as a dangerous Modernist. But His teaching was a wonderful revivification of religious ideas based on the opening sentence of His Ministry: "Change your minds; for the Sovereign God is near to you." But His action, His Death, and the Victory over Death and the sending of the Holy Spirit is so transcendently great, because it not only teaches but reveals and manifests the nearness of God, and thereby makes even Christ's sublime teaching and moral example of subordinate importance. But all His work took up into the Gospel all that was vital, true, and inspired in the Old Testament. Is it, then, consistent with loyalty to Christ's method to sever as far as possible the religion of to-day from the teaching of the past? Will the Modernists ponder a while on this question, for they seem to us to be labouring to show that the Sovereign God is more and more distant and not Sovereign at all? We would ask also that this question should not be answered by extolling the claims of the "younger generation," or by a vague appeal to the progress of knowledge in the last 100 years; for we cannot see that Darwinism makes any difference to the validity of the warning, "No man can say that Jesus Christ is Lord but by the Holy Spirit." Lastly, may we say that there are many "orthodox" Churchmen who differ from Modernists, not in the welcome they give to scientific discoveries, but as to the fair inferences to be drawn from them.

E. LYTTELTON.

THE DIVINE "MUST"

THERE are certain sayings of our blessed Lord which contain the word "must." Most of these were uttered with reference to His Passion and Death; with the others, suggestive though they be, this paper is not concerned. In considering the former, it may be convenient in the first place to collect and view them as a whole.

There is first the group uttered before the Passion: for the present purpose no attempt need be made to determine the exact order in which the Sayings occur. We may begin with the words to Nicodemus in St. John iii. 14: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up"—an expression which the Lord repeated more than once (viii. 28; xii. 34). On the last occasion His hearers made it clear that they understood this to be a phrase alluding to death.

Then there is the announcement which immediately followed what is known as St. Peter's confession: "The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be slain, and be raised again the third day" (St. Luke ix. 22). This Saying, paralleled in St. Matt. xvi. 21 and St. Mark viii. 31, is the first of the three great predictions which grow in detail as time goes on. It is of such weight, and occurs so suddenly, that the Lord seems to have deliberately waited for a fitting opportunity to utter it, and found that opportunity when at last some mortal man had penetrated the secret of His personality as the Son of the living God.

Then there is the Saying in St. Luke xiii. 33: "I must go on My way to-day, to-morrow, and the day following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem."

And that in St. Luke xvii. 25: "So shall also the Son of man be in His day. But first must He suffer many things, and be rejected of this generation."

Then in the Upper Room, just when setting out for the garden of Gethsemane, He tells the twelve that they must expect no better treatment than He received Himself, and says (St. Luke xxii. 37): "This which is written must be fulfilled in Me, And He was reckoned with the transgressors: for that which concerneth Me hath fulfilment."

And there is the Saying addressed to St. Peter just before leaving the garden (St. Matt. xxvi. 54): "How then should the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?"

After the Resurrection there is the reminder of the angel to the women: "Remember how He spake unto you while He was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again" (St. Luke xxiv. 7). Finally there are the Lord's words on the way to Emmaus in v. 26: "Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory?" and in v. 44, "All things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and in the prophets and in the psalms concerning Me. . . . Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day."

I

Looking back over this collection of Sayings relating to the Passion and containing the word "must," we observe that it is predominantly to St. Luke that we owe them; indeed, it is chiefly he, in one or other of his writings, who notices the Lord's use of this word in other connections. The nearest parallel to this in the New Testament is in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the author of which alone finds a use for such words as "it became Him," "it behoved Him," in similar reference to the Passion. So St. Luke, with his vivid sense of the value and significance of words, was specially affected by the Lord's use of this word in this connection, and therefore by that which it portends. For such use reveals how large a place the considerations which underlie it occupied in His sacred thoughts; and we may well endeavour to explore the perspective which it unveils and illumines. Nor are we without help in making this attempt to reconstruct that line of reasoning or purpose which He discloses in this sudden and unexplained word; for this thought of the necessity for divine suffering bears behind it a very long trail of history in the Old Testament which, beyond doubt, was perfectly familiar to the Lord. Although centuries elapsed between the prophetic books and His first recorded prediction of the Passion, there are phrases in each which follow similar lines; on the showing of both psalms and prophecies, it was foreshadowed that both pain and death awaited one who would personify the best that Israel could produce, and the thoughts in Psalm xxii. and Isaiah liii. are not incongruous with the tenor of the Lord's words concerning His Passion.

But both prophet and psalmist could trace their perception of these things to a much earlier source in the story of Isaac, in which the words, "My son, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering," covered so very much more than they seemed, that the whole history of the Israelites might almost be said to be summed up in this single utterance of their forefather.

These famous words of Abraham have a still more ancient reference in words handed down from time immemorial: "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" (Gen. iii. 15), which imply that through human seed should come the power to destroy the evil represented as a serpent, but at the cost of suffering to itself.

And the veil is lifted even further yet, and we are taken right back into the precreation divine counsels themselves, when we hear in the Revelation of St. John (xiii. 8) of the Lamb slain, not only in type and figure, not even only on Calvary, but "from the foundation of the world." And St. Peter also (1 Pet. i. 18) writes of "the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot, who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world":

> "O Thou, before the world began,
> Ordained a sacrifice for man."
> (*Hymn* 554, *A. and M.*)

II

We have therefore to consider how the Lord, in brooding over these scriptures, would pass beyond and behind them into these same divine counsels. Whence arose all this long line of thought, stretching back into the immemorial past, and pointing all in the same direction? This word "must" not only linked all the former ages of the world together, but brought out a thought eternal in the mind of God. For the thought of the possibility of divine pain arose not with, but before, the act of creation: it expresses, that is, an abiding characteristic in the eternal order. That we may the better understand this, let us raise the question why it was that God, glorious in His own perfection though He is, would ever conceive the idea of creation at all. What was His object in creating the world? We cannot reasonably ask when this thought first entered the divine mind, but we may becomingly enquire why it did so. And before attempting to answer this question, we should endeavour to estimate what is involved in it. In conceiving the idea of summoning into existence a race of free beings at all, the point of absolute essentiality was that in a real sense they should indeed be free. The Creator would be jealous of the least interference with this freedom; unless it were secured, the scheme would lose all its interest for Him. He would even "tie His own Hands in making theirs free." He would locate them in an environment adapted to suggest, but without any sort of spiritual compulsion, the "everlasting power and divinity" behind it. If thus they were to be free indeed, then one of two things would

happen—they would either own or disown Him. How hard it was for perfect love even to entertain the bare thought of their rebellion, who can tell? Surely He hoped that they would repay love with love; and then there would be unmixed joy for their Maker. The defection of other created beings was, or would be (as differently constituted), no parallel. But, on the other hand, God had to consider what would happen if these free beings abused their freedom. In the event of their rebellion, it was evident that they were still to retain their freedom—and all their interest would depart if they did not—there would be no remedy but one. For to destroy them would mean that the whole marvellous work would be rendered useless. And merely to punish them would more probably brutalize and demoralize than persuade. A third way would alone remain—of winning them back through love: a path of thorns indeed. For love, acting on its own initiative among stunted, deflected, and hostile wills, would bring upon itself its own limitless agony. The only way of love would be the way of incarnation, and the way of incarnation would, under these conditions, lead through the valley of the shadow of death. This possibility of tragedy entailed by the act of creation seems to be the real significance of the passionate weeping in that mysterious figure which in Michael Angelo's "Creation of Adam" in the Sixtine Chapel, "crouches below the image of the Almighty, as He comes with forms of things to be, woman and her progeny, in the fold of His garment" (W. Pater's *The Renaissance*, chap. v.).

Now God knew all this very well, and deliberately took all this risk, when He created man. And the arresting thought, the thought which brings us into the heart of this matter, is that although before He made the world at all, God actually foresaw the possibility that rebellious and alienated wills might soon—and very soon—mar His new creation; yet still He thought it worth while to make this race of free beings. He clearly saw that if man were once to choose the path of ingratitude and disobedience and rebellion, then, as soon as ever it happened, not only would man have to suffer, but Himself also. And yet He still thought it worth while. And the wonder of it lies in the question why He should have thought so greatly worth while: worth while to make this sublime adventure, and to take this appalling risk. Would it not have been better not to take the risk at all?

III

Of two attempts which have been made to answer this problem, one is partially true, and the other untrue.

The answer which is true as far as it goes, is that the act of

creation did give to God all the joy there is in devising a magnificent and stupendous work. Even man knows that there are few joys more poignant than the joy of achievement—of bringing some deep or lovely thought into the external world so that the many may rejoice in it. And to devise and plan out everything in the universe, from the widest generalization or "law of nature" down to the smallest detail, such as the tiny glint of iridescence on the inner rim of a limpet-shell, which a child picks up and keeps among his treasures; to consider the relation of each part to the other, and the total effect of all together; to relate the whole, in its double aspect of visible and invisible, to Himself; to uphold it as a living thing from moment to moment; all this splendour of achievement gave, and yet gives, joy to Him that sitteth upon the Throne, for whose pleasure they are, and were created. And there need be no fear lest such a work, from the hands of so supreme a Craftsman, will be permitted to fail of its object; it will be finally for His everlasting glory. Through whatever strain it goes, nothing in the end will have made it of no avail. If the first divine "must" points to the necessity of dying, the final "must" points to the no less equal necessity of resurrection, and causes hope indeed to spring immortal.

But although this answer does give one true aspect of the matter, yet inasmuch as it scarcely touches the event of rebellion, it cannot be complete. And there is another, which fails to satisfy, not because it is incomplete, but because it is untrue. It has been urged that the reason why God made the world was because His love was so great and boundless as to need an innumerable host of objects upon which to expend itself; the text "God so loved the world" has been taken to imply this. But such a theory would deny the absolutely self-contained perfection of God. If He indeed needed further objects to love, then would He not be complete in Himself. Any answer, therefore, should be excluded which even distantly implies that the Father was not wholly and joyfully satisfied with that which He could find within His own Being, even the perfect response of the Eternal Son. He needed no more. And similarly we must beware of the least implication that there could be any sense of satiety or discontent within the divine Being; as though the world were His toy, and He had (perhaps continually) to invent for Himself a fresh diversion so as to avert the ennui of a staled interest. There must be a more solemn and adequate motive for creation than this. And where, where shall we find it, unless we are prepared to recognize that the desire of God for the creation of the world sprang from within, and not from without, the sphere of His love for the Eternal Son? It must be

remarked that when Holy Scripture alludes to this matter, it bases the desire upon this ground alone. "All things" (declares St. Paul to the Colossians—i. 16) were created not only "through," but also "unto" the Son. "In Him do all things consist." "In Him (Eph. i. 10) did the Father purpose to sum up all things, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth, . . . to the end that we should be to the praise of His glory." These passages, if we may rely on them as a thought, a divine thought, specially revealed to St. Paul, are of the few, the very few, which deal with the mystery of the ultimate beginnings. According to them, the creation was, in its inception, development, and consummation, all for the praise of the Son. It is for Him. It is all for love of the Son. It has no purpose beyond that. All is summed up in the Son. It is not therefore the primary purpose of God in creation to call into existence a vast number of beings whom the Son can love or who can love the Son, but rather, and far deeper than that, to afford to the Son Himself an illimitable opportunity of proving His love to the Father; as it is in the Son rather than in the Father that the creation is said to find its consummation. If this is not so, then there is no self-containedness in God. But if it is so, then this whole age-long human scene, this long-drawn out story of man, must be held only to reach its true significance as an expression of the infinity of the love which binds the Eternal Father and the Eternal Son. If we acknowledge this love to be the term behind which human minds cannot penetrate, we may find here an intelligible account of the fount and origin of the "musts" in Holy Scripture. Apart from the unfathomable depth of love within the divine being, there could be no "necessity" for the Passion of the Lord. The Unitarian conception of the Deity can envisage no such "must."

IV

At this point we have to recognize that it is not given to man to understand exactly what is meant by the names "Father" and "Son" as predicated of the Deity. But under the condition that no explanation of them can be satisfactory which traverses either the unity or the timelessness of God, we are justified in maintaining that these names do bring within reach of our apprehension a fact in the divine nature answering to an experience which is constant in normal human life. Let us, therefore, have the patience to consider this constant experience at its best. There is no purer human passion than the love of father and son—or, if you will, of parents and children. It is free from the drawbacks of other loves. It liberates, it enthralls not. It is spontaneous, it is of the spirit, it is a longing of heart for heart,

it is altogether lovely. It is different in kind from the love of husband and wife, of brothers and sisters and lovers, of friend and friend. It is the fusion of friendship with the heartfelt emotion of the tie of nature. There is wisdom in the father's tenderness; his love encourages the son to aspiration, effort, growth, nobility, achievement, even in the joy of response. The thought of the son is never long absent from his mind. He views all things in their relation to and interest for the son. He is grateful to those who are kind to him, and welcomes those whom he loves. Nor is the love of the son to the father inferior in beauty. It longs to make itself more worthy of the wisdom, trust, and admiration of which it is conscious. It takes continual counsel, it courts approval, it acts for the sole purpose of pleasing. It devises plans and surprises as proofs of gratitude and affection. It seeks to shame love by more. It wonders how far it can go: and what would happen if any severe strain were to test it. In countless lives the love of father and son is very heaven on earth. And even where this great happiness is not explicitly realized in a given instance, it is always present as an ideal. It is felt even in the disappointment of the father who is disappointed in his son, and in the disillusion of the son who is disillusioned in his father; for there could be no disappointment, no disillusion, were there not, deep in the heart of each, some tender and beautiful vision which estrangement may bedim but cannot dispel. The very fact that there is such an ideal points to a divine exemplar, and disposes man to greet a perfect manifestation in a nature better than his own. Nor need we fear lest we are thus reading into the divine nature a mere reflection of our own desires: God has purposefully provided us with this key to His own Heart. The constant succession of parents and children is of the deepest and most elemental things in the world, and is therefore one of the interpretations of God to it.

And everywhere in the Gospel story can be surely seen the evidence of the most wonderful father-son relation that ever could be. There, on the one hand, sounds the Voice which says, " This is My Beloved Son in Whom I am well pleased "; and on the other, " I do always the things that please Him." Somewhere within this unplumbed abyss of divine passion may be dimly discerned the answer to the sphinx-like riddle of the world. To call it into being was worth all the attendant risks, all the pain, and all the death, because this alone would provide a genuine and satisfying chance for love to see how far it could go. Thus creation is the adorable occasion for love to explore love's own content. How far could loyalty go ? how far obedience ? Was there no lower depth of devotion as yet unsounded ? As for the words " Not My will, but Thine, be done," what is the

uttermost expression which this principle could bear? It was indeed a joy to declare it in "the glory before the world was"; but how would it sound in some circumstance of agony? And in each new soul would lie a fresh opportunity for the eternal Son to prove His love to the Father who called it into existence. Moreover, to give to unnumbered beings the chance of sharing in this loyalty, this love, this devotion, would be a boon worthy of God. And these could only be shared by creatures who were free to show the contrary if they held it worth while. The reply to the question raised in this paper we may therefore take to be that the death of the Lord was only "necessary" in the sense that apart from it love could not test itself to the uttermost. This "necessity" of Holy Scripture is thus by no means identical with the pagan "anangke"; it is nowise mechanical, nor is it fatalistic, nor is it strictly logical, but it springs from love.

V

Two inferences may perhaps be here drawn from the foregoing considerations. The first is that we ourselves, whether we try to carry out the divine will or not, are caught in the same "necessity" of suffering; whether it reaches us as toil, isolation, bewilderment, disappointment, hostility, ill-health, or death. It cannot be maintained that it is never the will of God that man should suffer. The Creator of the world knew that if once sin appeared, the necessity of suffering would arise both for the Creator and for the world. Innocent persons do not for their innocence escape this necessity, and may not hope to be immune from pain any more than He was or is who is Innocence itself. "Or is"; for if the Lord Christ was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, He is also the Lamb slain to the end of time. He suffers in His own, and is afflicted in all their afflictions, and they suffer with Him ere they can be glorified with Him. The second is that the only true sense in which God can be said to "love the world" is in so far as He sees man use the capacity to reflect the love that burnt and burns in the Beloved Son. According to his use of this capacity is the growth of the soul. What else is in man that God can love him for? Why else should He take the smallest interest in those who have nought but what He gave them? We are indeed entitled to place the widest possible interpretation on the words, but surely it is the truth that God loves man as man loves the Beloved, and for no other reason whatsoever. For if a man seeks truth, or drinks deep of the mixed cup of life, or honestly loves his fellows, his soul is moving on lines which lead nowhere if not to Him who is truth and life and love. Wherefore "Kiss the Son,

lest He (the Father) be angry, and so ye perish from the right way: if His (the Father's) wrath be kindled, yea, but a little, blessed are all they that trust in Him (in the Son)." And if, in the instance of this text (Ps. ii. 12) we be sternly confronted with the rendering of the Septuagint ("lay hold of instruction"), we can only say that the mistranslation, if such it be, has blundered into a deeper truth than dawned upon the psalmist's dream.

BERTHOLD A. BROWNING.

THE PLACE AND VALUE OF PASTORAL VISITING TO-DAY*

"And furthermore, it is his office to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the parish" (Ordering of Deacons).

"To seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for His children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever" (Ordering of Priests).

THE words ought to start old memories and carry us back to the morning of our Ordination! Most of us, I fancy, felt that we were in for an adventure, and we cherished dreams of doing great things for God—not least, I think, among the people who were outside the influence of the Church. Doubtless our dreams were mixed with ignorance and folly, but the conception of the Church as a militant force attacking strongholds of evil and seeking those outside the fold was in essence a true idea. We cherished pictures of men who had made the venture—Our Lord Himself, the Friend of publicans and sinners, the missions of the Twelve and the Seventy, the troubadours of St. Francis, the gallant St. Vincent de Paul, and all the noble army of men and women who have gone out into the world to win souls for Christ; and then, when we came face to face with facts in a parish, we found that the glow of adventure soon faded, and too often it became a dull drab matter of duty, with little atmosphere of romance.

I do not believe that Pastoral Visitation occupies the place of importance in the life of the Clergy which it occupied thirty years ago. The excuses for this are mainly set forth under two heads: (*a*) In Town Parishes, the large population, frequently changing, and the shortage of Clergy, who are overcrowded with manifold duties, make it impossible to do regular visiting, except on the sick. (*b*) In Country Parishes, the difficulty is that visiting must not be overdone, lest familiarity

* A paper read at Pontefract to the clergy.

breed contempt; but it is probably true that one cause of our failure is sloth, and another cause is that many of the Clergy have grave doubts of the real value of house-to-house visiting, and consequently they put their energy into other activities of parish life.

I am writing this paper in order to ask whether we ought not to face the ordering of our parochial duties with a recovered sense of the primary importance of visiting the people committed to our care.

For what is our ideal, as Priests in the Church of Christ? Can we suppose that it is enough for us to visit the devout members of our congregation, and to restrict our energies to the faithful communicants, leaving unshepherded the men and women who do not attach themselves to any form of organized religion?

In the urban districts the difficulty of Pastoral Visitation is emphasized by the collapse of the Parochial System in part. No longer do Churchpeople feel obligation to go to their Parish Church. They select the Church in their neighbourhood which they prefer and attach themselves to it, encouraged by the recent Church Assembly Measure affording opportunity to non-parishioners to place themselves on the Roll of the parish where they worship. The tendency of the Incumbent is to visit the faithful members of his congregation in the parish and outside those limits, and so the indifferent and the careless in the parish are neglected. The intensive method of shepherding the faithful is carried on at the expense of those outside the fold. Many of our Churchpeople are exacting and expect too much of their parish priest, and it certainly seems to me that the communicant members of our churches should be the last to make great demands on their Clergy to visit them—on the contrary, they should be zealous as members of a Missionary Church to go out into the streets and lanes and compel those outside to come in.

I believe that the whole system of our Pastoral Visitation method needs to be reconsidered to-day, and the subject might form a useful topic of debate at a meeting of our Parochial Church Council!

As we study the Life and Teaching of our Master, and remember our Ordination Vow, can we honestly feel that the straying and indifferent, the slack, the lapsed, the lonely, the lodgers, or those definitely known to be living in sin, have no claim on us? The pungent words of the Dean of St. Paul's may not be pleasant, but they contain deep truth: "The weakness of the Church of England lies largely in the fact that the gardeners are all in the hot-house!" Surely, according to our

power and opportunity, the souls outside our congregations have a claim on our pastoral zeal and love. In the Day of Judgment shall they be able to accuse us: "You passed us by. You left us alone. You never stretched out a hand nor spoke a word to warn or exhort us"?

As we review the thousands of days since our Ordination and remember our visits to our people, are we not inclined to ask "Cui bono"? To whose profit has it been? And then conscience whispers: "*Why was it all so futile?* Did I try to get through a long list of calls just to satisfy my sense of duty, without much preparation of prayer and without much purpose and love of souls? Or did I go as the representative of my Master, His Messenger and under-shepherd, sanctified by prayer, and so prepared for any human need or trouble that might arise?

It is very doubtful if the statutory hours of visiting, from 2.30 to 5 p.m., are really satisfactory and adequate, because it means that such calls entirely leave the men out! Some of the most useful visiting may be done in the evening, when it is often possible to catch the men at home, and in spite of the criticism of the Church to-day, there is nearly always a kindly welcome for the parson, and the laity are friendly and responsive when they find sympathy and understanding. These evening visits are valuable in their influence on the parish priest and those with whom he comes into contact. They help to dispel misunderstandings, and not infrequently the conversation comes to spiritual perplexities and personal difficulties, affording a real opportunity of friendship and help. The secret of good visiting is the spirit of respect for human nature with its Divine possibilities and sympathy for our fellows in the manifold struggles and disciplines of daily life, and this spirit of love is the only key that can open doors, which otherwise are closed. At the lowest estimate, the visiting parson will find that the people to whom he came in the day of their prosperity will want him in the day of trouble.

Let us think of some departments of the work.

(*a*) *Visiting of the Whole and Healthy*—the most difficult of all, and, the more prosperous and educated, hardest of all. Many educated people tell us that "never in their lives has a clergyman spoken to them a straight word on religion." It requires real grace of courage and love to try and get closer to folk who do not seem to want religion, but we must remember that English people are very shy and find it difficult to talk about spiritual things. It is often the simplest way to be quite direct and to ask a blunt question in love: "What about your prayers? Are you happy about them?" At least this gives

an opportunity for a heart-to-heart talk. There may be occasions when it is our duty to kneel and pray before we leave the house—and here we must rely on the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

But the visiting of the whole need not be a waste of time, as some think. In their day of need, they will remember the man who called and spoke to them like a friend. This kind of Pastoral Visiting needs real courage, as Bishop Gott used to say: "The prosperous and well-to-do people suffer horribly from our unpastoral cowardice."

I feel quite certain that we lack the *direct dealing method* in the Church of England. The best type of men and women, whether religious or not, expect us to be interested in their spiritual life and to justify our reverend title. They respect a man who is keen and fearless and is not ashamed to speak openly about religion.

The crises of domestic life, the occasions of baptisms, weddings, deaths, and the manifold emergencies of existence which bring us face to face with our people at times when their deeper emotions are stirred, afford opportunity for straightforward and direct dealing with souls. We need never fear that we shall cause offence to the Church, provided that we speak the truth in love. Men respect sincerity and courage, and it is not uncommon when tackling a man alone about his spiritual life to be met with the response actually made to me: "I have been waiting for this for years. I wondered if the Clergy would speak straight to me once before I die, for, after all, that's your job!"

(*b*) *Visiting of the Sick.*—There can surely be no excuse for the omission of this plain duty. ("I was sick and ye visited Me.") The fact of a special service in our Prayer Book for the Visitation of the Sick proves the importance of this Ministry. And yet most of us find the service in the present Prayer Book quite impossible to use *in toto*. It contains some beautiful prayers, but the whole spirit of the service is suggestive of a speedy termination of the sufferer's life here, and is not suitable for the ordinary cases of sickness. Nor is its language adapted for any except the few who appreciate the rhythm and beauty of our Liturgy. I suggest that the Form of the Visitation of the Sick in the proposed Alternative Prayer Book is one of the most valuable enrichments suggested, and the prayers and litany provided would make this service full of teaching and comfort to the sick members of our flock.

We hear many reproaches against the Clergy for their neglect of visiting the sick. Some of these charges are ridiculous, and some, alas! are well-founded. We all know the strange idea that the parish priest is supposed, wizard-like, to know of all

cases of sickness in the parish, without being sent for! But it sometimes happens that the Clergy postpone their visit to a sick-bed, and sometimes it escapes their memory, and strange as it sounds, occasionally they visit the patient, but leave him without a word of prayer or religious conversation of any kind.

May I hazard one or two suggestions?

1. It is a great consideration if we try to adhere more or less to certain hours for our visits. In many poorer homes it is hard to get through the day's work and keep the patient's room tidied up and ready for a visitor. The sick person likes to know when we are coming, and it saves time and fuss.

2. In cases of long-continued illness there is opportunity for regular and systematic *teaching*. A sick man is often very ignorant, but too shy to confess it, and a series of very simple talks on the Creed can be very useful. This teaching should lead up to the Sacraments always, and the priest should aim at making the sick person desire to receive Holy Communion. At a later stage we can make our *teaching* deal with the various aspects of the Holy Eucharist, and so use the opportunity of the sick-room for building up in the faith.

Sick people have much time for *thought*. It is for us to give them something to think about, and it is not difficult to suggest simple schemes of Bible-reading and meditation to help them in times of pain and sleepless nights.

3. In the case of dying people, great gentleness with courage is needed by the parish priest. It often means a tactful banishing of friends from the sick-room, and then an effort to convince the dying person of sin and forgiveness.

It is our clear duty to help the dying to face death where the doctors permit the patient to be aware of his grievous state, and the Prayer Book leaves it without misunderstanding that it is the priest's business to help the dying to peace, through settling his worldly concerns, through righting wrongs, and through confession of sin.

The priest who visits the dying will often require great wisdom in helping the sick person to get right with God. Frequently the time will be so short, and sometimes the power of ignorance so great, that the grace of right judgment will be sorely needed. If the truth were known, most of our people have some stains on their past lives which have left an indelible place in memory, and when they come to die their conscience is ill at ease. It is for us to help such people to come face to face with the fact of God and His Love in Jesus Christ, and in that light to measure their own sins and unfitness, and by real penitence to get rid of the complex that troubles their conscience and hinders the sense of God's Peace.

There are many people who would be thankful to make their Confession, if they only knew the peace and happiness that ensue from Absolution. It is a help to this end if we explain the words of the Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick and encourage sick persons to use this Means of Grace, assuring them that we Clergy who make our Sacramental Confession from time to time find therein unspeakable relief and comfort.

4. In visiting generally it is wise to assume that people are better than they really are; it is safe to assume that, all circumstances considered, they are better than ourselves. When one knows the fierce fire of temptation which tries the average human being in daily life, it is to be wondered sometimes that men and women are as good as they are! The policy of believing them to be better than they are will often bring a man to be his own accuser. The decent Englishman hates hypocrisy, and he will not tolerate our high opinion of him, because he knows himself. This will bring us closer as fellow-sinners, and if once we can tear down the curtain of reserve, the confidence of a human soul is a precious and holy thing.

Pastoral Visiting has a very great return value. It is, of course, impossible to measure spiritual values, but the approval of conscience is an acid test of the value of most duties, and the glow of happiness at the end of a hard day's visiting will be familiar to many who read this article. I would suggest that we keep Fridays generally as a day for making those visits which are least pleasant and most difficult. The inspiration of the thought of the Cross on Calvary as we go into some court or tenement to see a man stricken with some horrible malignant disease is a great comfort and strength.

Then the gratitude of sick people generally is out of all proportion to our pains! Long after we have left the parish we are remembered affectionately by certain people, not for our preaching or for our work on committees and clubs, but for our friendly visits and for our sympathy and love! It is the visiting parson who makes the Church of England still a very dear and pleasant institution in the land. But the real return value for us priests lies in what the sick people we visit teach us! Their simple faith, their fortitude, their endurance of pain, their realization of Christ's Presence, their bravery in awful anxieties about food and rent and uncertainty of work, and too often in homes which are not worthy of the name. I believe that most of our deepest lessons of human life and its diviner qualities are learnt in the sick-room, and so it comes to pass that the preacher whose message really goes home to the heart of his people has often learnt the spirit of his sermon from his daily visits among his flock.

One word about the cost of visiting. Shall we expect that any work done for Christ and according to His Will shall not be marked by sacrifice? We know the effort, in a hot day in summer, or in the biting winds of January, in streets or lanes wet and snow-covered, leaving the fireside and the comfortable chair, day by day, to visit, it may be, some dull or querulous person, who insists on giving you detailed geography of their bodily ills; how we sometimes hate the drab line of streets, the slum and its smells, the pretentious piano and window curtains, the awful array of early Victorian prints, the antimacassars in the parlour, and yet behind the ugliness and sordid exterior are men and women ignorant, unhappy, lonely, sinful, tempted, puzzled, and some of them dreadfully afraid to die! "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye did it unto Me."

It is time for me to bring these words to a close.

Our great and holy Ministry has many sides and many duties. We are Messengers, Watchmen, and Stewards. We are charged with the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments. We are placed in charge of the souls in our parish or district, and for these we must give account to God.

The Church needs all sorts of character and temperament among her Ministers. She requires manifold gifts and talents: the intellect of scholars, the earnestness of prophets, the capacity of men of affairs, the holiness of priests; but I venture to say that there is no side of our priestly function which is more necessary than the faithfulness of her pastors, the sympathy and love of those who seek out Christ's sheep and demonstrate the Love of Christ in going out and coming in among His people.

Many of our most ignorant folk will never enter our churches. We must carry the message of the Church to them, and give them an opportunity. And as long as the world lasts the parish priest who visits his people faithfully will stand to them as "the man of God," who comes among them from his altar and his prayers and carries the Grace of God, and keeps alive in the minds of men the life and work of the Divine Shepherd "who went about doing good."

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS.

Since times and conditions have greatly changed in these recent years —and in the face of (1) the grievous shortage of clergy and (2) the great increase of parochial organizations, conferences and meetings—I venture to suggest that the matter of Pastoral Visiting needs to be reconsidered by the Church at large. Here are some questions which might form the subject of a useful and live discussion at a Parochial Church Council meeting.

1. If it is the duty of the Clergy to know their people and to visit "house to house" in our larger parishes, how can it best be done to-day? Can the faithful laity help?

2. If the Parish Priest is primarily responsible for the care of the souls in his parish, what method of getting into personal touch with the members of the congregation living outside the parish can be adopted?

3. Is it not the duty of the communicant members of a congregation to co-operate with the Clergy in seeking those without, and not to demand regular visits themselves?

4. What is the best method of getting to know strangers and newcomers who would welcome a visit from the Clergy?

5. Is it desirable that visiting should have a more prominent place in the duties of the Clergy, and if so, what is to happen to the numerous parochial organizations which crowd the day of an over-busy priest?

These suggestions come from the heart of one who believes that visiting is not only one of our first duties as priests, but also the greatest strength in the Church of our land.

CECIL COOPER.

SIR EDWYN HOSKYNS, PRIEST AND BISHOP

IV. As Bishop

THE diocese of Southwell over which in 1904 Sir Edwyn Hoskyns was called to rule was one of the largest in England, comprising the two counties of Nottingham and Derby, with their capital cities, their immense coal-fields studded with mining towns, and large acres of country-side and hill. It was an artificial creation, made by relieving the sees of Lichfield and Lincoln of a county each; and, though George Ridding, the first Bishop, had laid the foundations of its diocesan organization with conspicuous success, the union between the two counties thus solemnized by the Church could not be regarded as other than a *mariage de convenance*. To this unwieldy diocese Bishop Hoskyns devoted twenty-one years of unremitting labour and love. His training for the task had been almost ideal. Thirty years of wide and varied pastoral experience, in London and the North, in country villages as well as in cities; an arduous and singularly successful period of special work in S. Africa; several years of close co-operation, first as Vicar of Bolton and then as Bishop of Burnley, with Bishop Moorhouse of Manchester, for whose personality and work he felt a profound admiration—these things constituted a wonderful equipment for the work that lay before him.

And it was essentially a pastoral work. There are some dioceses in England, such as Winchester or Durham, where

historical tradition has invested the episcopal office with a more than diocesan importance. In these cases the Bishop is expected to interpret the oversight committed to him as covering not only the Church within its titular borders, but also those larger currents of national and ecclesiastical life and thought which figure so largely in the popular mind. Again, there are some dioceses, though indeed few enough, whose size or homogeneity permits the Bishop to devote some of his time to the regular pursuit of learning or the handling of some particular aspect of the Church's work. But the great majority of English dioceses fall into neither of these two classes; and Southwell was certainly one of them. The ideal which Bishop Hoskyns set before himself was that of chief Pastor of a definite flock committed to him by authority. Other interests and claims would and did come upon him, especially in the War. He was regular in attendance at the Church Assembly, though he rarely spoke; he looked forward with particular interest to taking a share in the Bishops' deliberations on Prayer Book Revision; central societies of the Church, above all the S.P.G. (for whose meetings he used to fill the People's Palace in the Mile End Road), could count on his breezy and vigorous support at all times. But none of these things ever diverted him from his main purpose, duty, and joy. That was to oversee, confirm, and develop the pastoral work of the Church in his own diocese; to know his people, both clergy and laity; and to bring the light of Christ to bear upon the lives and thoughts of the great industrial community entrusted to his charge.

The possibility of compassing such a task depended in the first instance on organization. The Bishop had the kind of instinct for organization which marks the great commander. He was never lost in it, but knew that without it strong and harmonious action was impossible: it was an instrument, not an end, but an instrument which could not be neglected. Himself "under authority," he could expect, and he received, the loyal obedience and co-operation of others. The administrative machinery which he used was never allowed to become mechanical; rather it embodied simply the uniformities and fixed principles of the clear vision and indomitable will of the chief. The result was that people knew where they were with him; and on that basis the closest personal relationship became possible, and men felt their energies released.

In a diocese of 500 parishes a bishop might have been excused if he had discharged his visitatorial functions mainly through the delivery of Charges. It was characteristic of Bishop Hoskyns that he inverted the usual procedure; and instead of issuing in book form any formal Visitation Charge, he counted

it his duty to visit in person every parish in his jurisdiction. A questionnaire was issued to each incumbent, intended to elicit the main facts of the life of the Church in his parish; and the answers to this provided the preliminary information on which the visitation was to be based. So far as possible, the Bishop dealt with a rural deanery at a time, closing his visits to the several parishes with a meeting for the deanery as a whole. In each parish clergy and laity alike were summoned to attend in church; and there the Bishop would go with them into every detail of their local Church life. At first, some of the clergy were inclined to be alarmed at what promised to be a somewhat rigorous inquiry; but suspicion was very quickly disarmed as his methods became known, and as the visits proved to be a source of new intimacy between bishop, priest, and people, and of fresh spiritual power to all. No detail was overlooked. The Church plate and linen and books were inspected; the Church accounts and the safe-keeping of the monies were examined and discussed; in one pit-village, for instance, where the churchwarden, a working miner, was accustomed to keep the collections in a stocking at home, better methods of custody were suggested. Full and frank consultation took place on these occasions as to the needs of the parish—whether of buildings, such as mission-room or school, or of additional staff, or of help and advice on particular sides of the parochial work. And the laity no less than the clergy found in these unusual occasions in church a chance of disburdening of conscience or of fresh resolution. In one place an incumbent and a churchwarden, who had not spoken to one another for years, shook hands before the congregation; in another, where the religious training in the home was the subject of discussion, fathers and mothers told how they heard their children's prayers when the day's work was done or what books they read to them on Sundays. As each deanery was concluded, the Bishop drew up a report on the main facts and needs he had formed within it, which was published in the Diocesan Chronicle. Such reports might rightly be called Visitation Charges.

To his Visitation, and to what they saw of their Bishop through it, must be traced, more than to anything else, the deep love and confidence which his clergy unreservedly accorded him. They saw that he understood completely the very various conditions which affect the life and work of the parish priest; that he sympathized with their joys and sorrows, hopes, trials, and disappointments; that he was wholly reliable, gentle, and hopeful, in his judgment. If a round man was in a square hole, the Bishop would see what he needed and move him; if a priest was overworked, he would point out ways of easing the burden,

or sick, and he would come to the bedside; and the wives of the clergy knew that he was their friend no less than their husbands'. And this large humanity which he brought to the discharge of his office enabled him to call for the highest standard of pastoral work and witness. With neglect of duty, with foolishness, above all with the rare cases of serious moral lapse he was inexorably stern. But the vast majority of his clergy were only too glad to look up to him, and follow him, as a leader who would bring out of them the best that they could give: all the more as he rarely gave direct advice, but rather pointed the way by which those who sought his counsel might be helped to decide rightly for themselves.

In this atmosphere of mutual trust and love, it was not difficult for the Bishop of Southwell to impart, nor for his brethren in the ministry to imbibe, the high ideals of the priesthood which he held. None who were ordained at Southwell can forget the spirit which suffused the last days of preparation at Bishop's Manor; the immense pains he took with each individual and the conception of his vocation which he set before him; the quiet reverence and mystery of the Ordination itself. Then, and afterwards, the Bishop laid especial stress upon the two interior duties of prayer and study—interior, because they are duties of which the world outside can know little, and which it is therefore easy to let slide. Whenever possible, he attended himself the annual Retreat for the clergy of the diocese, and fostered every movement for the deepening of the devotional life; while it may be questioned whether there was any diocese in England where a higher standard of knowledge was required of candidates for Ordination. His own priesthood was never lost amid the manifold activities of a Bishop's life; nor did he conceive the authority given him to ordain and to confirm as in any way superseding his authority to celebrate and to teach. Sometimes, indeed, it used to grieve him that he had no parish altar of his own. Preaching in Southwell Minster on the day after the funeral, the Bishop of Newcastle recalled how he had said to him: "There is one thing you will miss as a Bishop—it is not having your own altar with your own congregation round it Sunday by Sunday. The Bishop has many altars, but outside his private Chapel there is none that he can call his own."

This warm pastoral sense which found its highest joy in knowing the members of the flock by name and in gathering them to the Lord's Table for worship and grace was the secret of the harmony and peace which pervaded the diocese. The Bishop knew what his clergy were driving at, and he was able to discount all party labels and see with expert and unprejudiced

eyes the real work and the real aims behind them. A few months before his death he was asked whether he had found the Anglo-Catholics in his diocese difficult to deal with; and his answer was, "I only wish I had more of them"—an answer which is doubly worth recording in view of current suspicion and misunderstandings. For the answer sprang from a simple judgment as to work done for Christ and His Kingdom. It did not preclude him from condemning narrow and rigid methods, nor from barring certain lines of advance which he did not consider fruitful: still less did it preclude him from a generous appreciation of good work on Evangelical lines. A man who loved and taught his people and built them up as living members of Christ's Church could be certain of the Bishop's support, whatever his "colour." But he did feel that English religion needed the definite teaching and the bracing discipline which the Catholic movement stood for; and doctrinaire criticism of it by those who had no experience of parochial life seemed to him foolish and unjust in itself, and disastrous to the true welfare of the Church.

It must not, however, be supposed that the Bishop allowed this close and affectionate oversight of his clergy to absorb all his interests and energies.

In every diocese there are a number of institutions of various kinds which are quite outside the parochial system, and yet play a vital part in the spiritual life of Church and nation. The position of a Bishop in relation to such groups is often not easily defined; and in all cases the extent to which their membership in the larger family of the Church becomes a reality to them will depend mainly on the personality and tact of the holder of the see. Bishop Hoskyns saw the importance of these subtle ligaments in the spiritual organism of the Body and quickened them with his own enthusiasm and faith. The impression he made, for instance, at Repton School is thus depicted by a boy there in a letter home:

> I think the most wonderful thing about him was his extraordinary power of making people admire him, and not only admire him, but love him too. Although he only used to come here twice a year, and on those occasions only a few people actually spoke to him, or saw him other than in the Chapel, he so attracted people that they at once took to liking him, and remembered him as preaching the best sermons the Chapel had ever heard, or as the man who confirmed them. The School has been more depressed to-day than I ever remember it to have been before, and I am sure it is not all Bishops who could have done that.

A parallel testimony to the happiness which the Bishop brought on Confirmation days was borne by the Headmaster. He was indeed wholly in his element and entirely happy himself in any kind of school or college.

Problems of a very different order were presented by the existence within the Southwell diocese of Swanwick and of Kelham. Swanwick is a name to conjure with in circles connected with the Student Movement; for its summer camps and conferences are housed there. The Bishop is brought into relation with the Movement through the fact that the Parish Church adjoins the precincts of the institution and is to some extent used for its services. All who have attended a Student Movement "week" know how quickly the spirit of Christian brotherhood grows and how artificial the old denominational barriers come to appear. Inevitably the desire has arisen to express this sense of unity in Eucharistic worship; and from time to time joint Communion services have been urged. The Bishop had the greatest sympathy with the aims and work of the Student Movement, but he did not feel that he could allow the use of the Parish Church for this purpose. He felt that he would have been compromising permanent principles of the Church's catholicity for a transient and largely emotional end. And it says much for the tact of both sides that his refusal led to no friction or loss of friendly feeling between them.

From Swanwick to Kelham is no far cry; for both have a common element in Father Kelly. The Bishop of Southwell was very proud of Kelham, and unreservedly glad when it was decided that the headquarters of the Society of the Sacred Mission was to stay within his jurisdiction. Its physical and intellectual vigour, its insistence on thorough training in theology and worship, its complete devotion to the cause of Christ and His Church—all these things appealed to him immensely; and he watched over and encouraged its growth with the keenest interest. He regarded it as a great educational experiment destined to play an ever larger part in the future of the Anglican Communion, supplying her with priests of sound knowledge and dedicated life, whose Catholicism was definite and yet not Roman. No ceremony at the Bishop's obsequies was more moving or more appropriate than the Requiem celebrated in the Minster by the party from Kelham in the middle watches of the night before his interment.

One of the Bishop's chief concerns in later years was the spiritual care of the great new populations which were ceaselessly migrating into the two counties. The expansion of the Nottinghamshire coal-field in particular called for unceasing vigilance, foresight, and energy; and the Bishop made it his business to be in touch with the various directorates, wherever this was possible, and to urge upon them the duty of making provision for the worship, education, and social welfare of the pit-villages which they were calling into existence. It is gratifying to know that in many cases he met with a ready response; and his chief

anxiety came less from the difficulty of building churches or mission-rooms than from that of adequately staffing them. One of his great desires was for young men who would band together and work somewhat on Bush Brotherhood lines, tackling the problem on missionary lines. Another, and a larger, one was, of course, the division of the diocese.

The way in which the Bishop interpreted his pastoral office was abundantly illustrated during the War. Not only were his visits and letters to the bereaved a source of unfailing consolation and strength; but he felt and showed a fatherly care for the troops who went from, or were encamped in, his diocese. Wherever troops were in training, he visited their camp and established contact with the O.C. and with the Chaplains, and in some cases, as at Clipstone, was the means of securing adequate equipment for the spiritual and social work of the Church in the camp. With his own clergy who were on active service, and with officers of the county battalions in the field, he maintained a frequent correspondence. When possible, he would visit a regiment before its departure for the front, and give them his blessing. And no detail escaped him. At the very outset of the War, he found a battalion of Territorials being served out with their enlistment money—£5 a man. Realizing at once the danger of so large a sum in cash in inexperienced hands, he suggested that arrangements should be made whereby the men could deposit it: a leading Nottingham banker was at once telephoned to, and within a few hours coupons had been prepared and were issued to the men as vouchers for their deposits. By the end of the War, the Bishop had come to feel strongly, as a result of his experience, that the relation of an Army Chaplain on service to the Bishop of the diocese where he was quartered needed to be put on a far clearer and sounder basis.

Throughout all these various activities and labours the Bishop never forgot the peculiar duties and joys of home. All that that word can mean to Englishmen it meant to him; and its ideals were among the strongest influences of his life. No cares of office were allowed to mar its serenity and peace; it had an inalienable prerogative of its own as the centre of interests, affections, and relationships which made a unique claim and called for their own response. At his table the Bishop was always host; letters, and even the newspaper, were left unread until breakfast was over; he made of every meal a kind of party; and the larger the company, especially if it contained children, the happier he was. He entered with zest into every topic of conversation, be it grave or gay, of work or games, of persons or politics, of knowledge or music or art; and on each could throw

some light of wisdom or fun from his own experience; and on summer evenings he loved nothing better than to show the rising generations that he was still more than their match on the tennis-court. His physical fitness, indeed, was always amazing—the result, partly, of a naturally strong constitution, but partly of a steady discipline of the body—in food, sleep, and exercise—which was never relaxed. And he showed a similar discipline of mind. Even the rooms assigned to his work were homely places, without suggestion of letters unanswered or papers undigested; the efficiency of those who served him and his own laconic replies to official correspondence left him time for the things that needed it; and he seemed never in arrears. And he was a regular reader. His library was that of one who had steadily kept himself abreast of the output of standard books in theology; while he usually had in hand some volume of biography or memoirs which had lately appeared. The result was that in mind and in body he was always fresh and fit.

* * * * *

Sir Edwyn Hoskyns had hoped to see his diocese divided and the Prayer Book revised before he closed the chapter of his life's work. But it was not to be; and those who knew him could not but feel how fitting it was that he should die "in harness." From the moment when the verdict was clear there was no repining nor looking back. We watched him quietly and steadfastly detaching himself from all earthly ties, in preparation for his last journey; and somehow he let us feel that he was doing this as much for our sakes as for his own. For himself, he gave his waking hours to devotion, using especially, in addition to the daily offices (which Lady Hoskyns used to read to him), Walter Hilton's *Scale of Perfection* and *The Priest's Book of Private Devotion*. He greatly valued the help which his Chaplain and others gave him in Meditation; and the Blessed Sacrament used to be brought to him regularly from the altar in the Minster or his own Chapel. He last received on the morning before he died. That evening he asked for his episcopal ring and cross, which had been by his bedside throughout his illness, to be put on him; and he lay throughout the night with the cross between his hands, sleeping or, if awake, in prayer. At 7.30 next morning he asked his nurse the time; and half an hour later he passed quietly and without struggle into the Beyond.

E. G. Selwyn.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The request made in our last issue for help in connexion with current periodicals has already met with a most encouraging response. The Dean of Winchester has undertaken to review *Analecta Bollandiana;* the Dean of Salisbury will take *Ephemerides Lovanensis* and *Nouvelle Revue Théologique;* and the Rev. H. S. Marshall (Vice-Principal of St. Boniface College, Warminster) and Dr. Prideaux (already known to our readers through his translations of the Odes of Solomon) will review the *International Review of Missions*, *Anglican Theological Review*, and *Canadian Journal of Religious Thought.* The *Journal of Religion* will go to the Rev. T. L. Harris, who studied recently for two years in America. Dr. Lowther Clarke will continue to keep us in touch with the great German *Zeitschriften* for O.T. and N.T. respectively. Meanwhile the Rev. W. S. Porter has volunteered short notes from time to time on a Spanish periodical entitled *La Rivista Ecclesiastica.*

We have received a copy of the first number of the *L. K. G. Quarterly*, the organ of the League of the Kingdom of God, of which Mr. Maurice Reckitt is Chairman and the Rev. Paul Stacy Secretary. The Editor is the Rev. Dudley J. Simon, Headmaster of Woodbridge School. The contributions are scholarly and thoughtful, and the paper should form a useful adjunct to the *Commonwealth* as a focus of Catholic social ideals.

In a recent issue we spoke of the *Imitation* as a book " for all who run." A correspondent writes to enter a *caveat*, and mentions cases in which the use of the *Imitation* has been attended with serious spiritual dangers. The testimony is such as we cannot gainsay; and we shall hope to return to the subject on some later occasion.

"A PROPHET LIKE UNTO ME"

No harder problem is set theologians than to ascertain what precisely was the Messianic consciousness of Our Lord. At each step we are confronted with the difficulty of distinguishing the original meaning of a saying or episode from the interpretation placed upon it in the Gospels by those who had come to a fuller realization of what Jesus was. So we try to find firm standing places in the morass of difficulties. I suggest that there are five of these, that the first is the firmest and that the others diminish in solidity in the order given.

1. It is generally recognized now that Our Lord called Himself Son of Man at the close of His ministry, in reference to Dan. vii. 13 and the amplification of the Heavenly Man conception in later Judaism which Ethiopic Enoch illustrates. He believed, that is, that He would come again in glory to inaugurate the Kingdom of God. Bousset's attempt to get rid of all the Son of Man passages is seen to be a failure. But we cannot insist on the occurrences of the phrase in the earlier parts of the Gospel, for there is no agreement as regards them on the part of scholars.

2. Shortly before His final journey to Jerusalem, Jesus elicited from His disciples the confession that He was the Messiah (Mark viii. 29).

He accepted the confession, but warned them that Messiahship entailed suffering and death. It seems probable that He had been helped to this conclusion by a study of Isa. liii. (*cf.* also Mark xiv. 24, "which is shed *for many*," with the "many" of Isa. liii. 11, 12).

3. The idea of Sonship might seem of foremost importance, but that the precise meaning is so hard to fix. That Our Lord at Baptism received an assured conviction that He was God's beloved Son (Mark i. 11) is borne out by other passages, but what does Son imply? An orthodox theologian like Dr. McNeile will not grant any Johannine meaning in Matt. xi. 27, "No man knoweth the Son . . ." "He knows Himself to be the champion and representative of the true Israel, the pious, humble, and oppressed . . . To Me, their Representative, the Son, the whole truth has been entrusted. None except Thee can know My Sonship, i.e. that I hold this representative office."*

4. The prophets were in the eyes of the Jews great and holy figures of the past. Their place had been taken by the scribes who expounded the Torah, written and unwritten, as the living guide of everyday life. But the possibility of their return was kept open. Thus in 1 Macc. xiv. 41 we read: "The Jews and the priests were well pleased that Simon should be their leader and high priest for ever, until there should arise a faithful prophet."† The enthusiasm with which the Hasmonean dynasty began waned in course of time, and many must have longed for the arrival of the faithful prophet to terminate their rule. John the Baptist was held by the people to be a prophet (Matt. xiv. 5), and Jesus, who continued John's preaching of the kingdom, was also a prophet, both in popular estimation (Mark vi. 15, viii. 28), and in His own (Mark vi. 4). But, even without these passages, we should infer that He was in line with the prophets of old, from the fact that He taught "with authority" (Matt. vii. 29), from intuitive knowledge of God's will, like the prophets with their "Thus saith the Lord," and not by appeals to precedents like the scribes.

If we ask about the nature of Our Lord's prophetic consciousness, the very early tradition contained in St. Peter's speech (Acts iii. 22) gives us the answer. "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken" (Deut. xviii. 15). No other passage in the O.T. gives us so suitable a point of departure. The wording of 1 Macc. xiv. 11 implies that this prophet had not yet arisen. The contrast with Moses found in Our Lord's "But I say unto you" is a natural outcome of a conviction that He was the prophet like unto Moses, to whom the people were bidden to hearken.

5. I come now to a line of thought which is highly speculative, but, like many speculations, fascinating to some minds. Our Lord was named Joshua (Jesus). Even in our own day a child called after a religious leader by pious parents is told in early years about his great namesake. In a time when "the name" had a mysterious potency, is it conceivable that the Virgin Mary did not impress upon the Child Jesus the story of Joshua, and tell Him that He too must grow up to be a Saviour of His people? And if this idea was implanted in early childhood, would it not be enormously powerful in later life, and, unconsciously as well as consciously,

* See *New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's*, p. 28 *f.*

† ἕως τοῦ ἀναστῆναι προφητὴν πιστόν. The reference is apparently to Deut. xviii. 15 προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμὲ ἀναστήσει κύριος ὁ θεός σου σοί and Num. xii. 7 (Moses) ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστός.

influence His thoughts and words? Presently I shall try to point out examples of this influence. But first I would suggest that the mind of Jesus would have dwelt earnestly upon one special part of Scripture, the relations of Moses with Joshua at the close of Deuteronomy. This was for Him of crucial importance. From it He may have been led to Deut. xviii. 15 and to other passages dealing with the same period of history. The two ideas may well have coalesced in His mind—that He was the new Joshua, destined to lead His people into a promised land, the realm in which God was king; and that He was the prophet like unto Moses. Both figures were represented in the Bible as succeeding to Moses' prerogatives.

The passage we propose to study in order to illustrate this speculation is Matt. iv. 1-v. 10. We stop at this point because the last words of v. 10 "for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" repeat the conclusion of the first Beatitude, and v. 11 may be regarded as an explanatory addition in Matthew's plan. The reader is requested to notice that I give all the evidence I can find, including what weakens the case; also that at this stage I assume St. Matthew to represent accurately the mind of Jesus, even in his chronological sequence and LXX allusions.

iv. 1. *Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted* (*πειρασθῆναι*) *of the devil.* He is recapitulating the experience of God's people in the wilderness. They were tempted to presume upon God's patience, and passed through an experience known as Massah or "the temptation." That an allusion to this underlies our verse is suggested by the second half of the quotation in *v.* 7 "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God, *as ye tempted him in Massah* (Deut. vi. 16; LXX *ὃν τρόπον ἐξεπειράσατε ἐν τῷ Πειρασμῷ*). This "day of temptation in the wilderness" is referred to in Psalm xcv., which is quoted in Heb. iii. 8-11, a context in which we find the parallel and contrast both between Moses and Christ (iii. 1-6), and between Joshua and the true Joshua (iv. 8).

2. *When he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he afterward hungered.* Matthew assimilates Our Lord's experience to that of Moses, by adding "and forty nights" and the hunger at the close of the period. See Deut. ix. 9 "I abode in the mount forty days and forty nights; I did neither eat bread nor drink water"; also Ex. xxxiv. 28.

3, 4. The first temptation is entirely founded on Deut. viii. *If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.* Israel, God's Son, was chastened and tempted in the wilderness, and fed with heavenly food. "Thou shalt consider in thine heart, that, as a man chasteneth *his son*, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee" (viii. 5). "That he might humble thee, to prove thee (*ἐκπειράσῃ σε*), to know what was in thine heart, whether thou wouldest keep his commandments, or no (2)." "And he humbled thee, *and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna . . .*" (3*a*). The answer to this temptation is provided by 3*b*, "that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by everything that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live."

5, 6, 7. No Deuteronomic parallel can be expected to the second temptation, or to the quotation from Psalm xci. which accompanies it. The answer is provided by the phrase from Deut. vi. 16, which we used above. Two verses later (vi. 18) occur the words "that it may be well with thee, and that thou mayest go in and possess the good land . . ." (*κληρονομήσῃς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθήν*), a thought which is found in Matt. v. 2, "they

shall inherit the land" (*κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν*). We shall recur to this presently.

8–10. In the third temptation Jesus is on a high mountain and sees all the kingdoms of the world and their glory. The devil says, *All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.* Here we have a Satanic parody of Deut. xxxiv. 1–4, where Moses goes up to Mount Nebo, and God shews him the land of Canaan, saying "This is the land which I sware unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, saying, I will give it unto thy seed." The temptation is repelled with words from Deut. vi. 13, immediately preceding those which answered the second temptation—"Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and him shalt thou serve, and shalt swear by his name" (*κύριον τὸν θεόν σου φοβηθήσῃ, καὶ αὐτῷ λατρεύσεις, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν κολληθήσῃ*). In 18 follows the promise to inherit the good land.

11. *Then the devil leaveth him; and, behold, angels came and ministered unto him.* Deuteronomy again provides a remarkable parallel, xxxii. 43 running thus in the LXX: "Rejoice, ye heavens, with him and let the sons of God worship him: Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people and let all the angels of God strengthen him" (*εὐφράνθητε, οὐρανοί, ἅμα αὐτῷ καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ υἱοὶ θεοῦ· εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ*).*

12–16. The Temptation over, Jesus returned to Galilee and settled in Capernaum. The prophecy of Isa. ix. 1 is fulfilled, *The land of Zebulun . . . Galilee of the Gentiles, the people which sat in darkness saw a great light. . . .*" In 11 we had a reference to Deut. xxxii. 43, in which verse the Gentiles are bidden rejoice with the chosen people. The connexion of thought is clear. Galilee is looked on as a half Gentile centre, and the ministry of Jesus, which at the end of the Gospel is for "all the nations," is typically represented here at the beginning as for Gentiles as well as Jews. Moses, in one of the Deuteronomy passages upon which this part of Matthew is based, had invited the Gentiles to share Israel's joy.

17. Jesus begins to proclaim repentance in view of the approach of the Kingdom; see v. 3, 10 for the qualifications of citizens of the Kingdom.

[18–22. A pericope from Mark, which does not concern us.]

23–25. A summary of the preaching and healing of Jesus. The mention of Syria and Decapolis confirms the impression derived from 15 that the Gentiles are included, at least ideally, in these activities.

So far the reader will probably have found no difficulty in following the argument. In attempting to trace a vein of O.T. allusion in the Beatitudes I shall probably seem very fanciful, but the way has undoubtedly been prepared by the O.T. basis of chapter iv. I recall the hypothesis with which I started, that Our Lord regarded Himself as a prophet like unto Moses; also as a second Joshua, raised up by God to save His people and lead them into the new promised land, the spiritual kingdom designed for them. If there is any basis of fact in this hypothesis, we shall now expect to find reminiscences of passages in Joshua as well as passages derived from Deuteronomy and perhaps other books describing the period of preparation in the wilderness.

After two introductory verses Our Lord begins the Sermon on the Mount with

v. 3. *Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.*

* *Cf.* Luke xxii. 43, *ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν.*

The word "blessed" is common in the O.T., especially in the Psalms. A passage which may have started the train of thought is provided by Deut. xxxiii. 29, where Moses concludes his blessing of Israel by declaring: "Happy (blessed) are thou, O Israel" (*μακάριος σύ, Ἰσραήλ*). He then ascends Mount Nebo, and the Lord shows him the promised land, a passage which underlies the third temptation.

4. *Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted.* Israel mourned for Moses thirty days, and were comforted by the accession of Joshua (Deut. xxxiv.). While the sense is derived from Deut., the language bears no resemblance to that of Matthew. However, on a previous occasion the people had mourned in an act of corporate penitence; see Num. xiv. 39, "the people mourned greatly" (*ἐπένθησεν ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα, cf.* Matt. *μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες*). They had just been condemned to forty years' wandering in the wilderness for their faithlessness. In the following verse they say "we have sinned," which illustrates the usual comment on Matt. v. 4, that the mourning is primarily for sin. The nearest O.T. parallel to the verse, however, is Isa. lxi. 2, "to comfort all that mourn" (*παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας*).

5. *Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the land* (not "earth," *μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς· ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν*). Shortly before the Numbers passage mentioned above, in xii. 3, we read "the man Moses was very meek" (*ὁ ἄνθρωπος Μωυσῆς πρᾶος σφόδρα*) and, in a neighbouring passage, xiv. 31, the Israelites are told that their children shall inherit the land (*κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν*). Neither Moses, though he was meek, nor that generation of Israelites inherited the land, but the meek to-day shall enter into the kingdom. Ps. xxxvii. 11 ("the meek shall inherit the land") is of course a closer parallel to Matt. v. 5.

6. *Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled* (*μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην· ὅτι αὐτοὶ χορτασθήσονται*). In Num. xi. the Israelites had hungered, lusting after the fleshpots of Egypt, and had received quails to supplement the manna. The important words of Matthew are found in Ps. cvii. 5, "hungry and thirsty (*πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες*), their soul fainted in them," and 9 "the hungry soul he filleth" (*ἐχόρτασε ψυχὴν κενήν*). The Psalm seems to refer to the return from exile, but *v.* 4 "they wandered *in the wilderness*" may have suggested *v.* 5, which would then be an echo of the earlier experiences of Israel.

7. *Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy* (*μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται*). So in Josh. ii. 12 Rahab and the spies enter upon a covenant to deal mercifully with one another, "Swear unto me by the Lord, since I have dealt kindly with you, that ye also will deal kindly with my father's house" (*ποιῶ ὑμῖν ἔλεος, ποιήσατε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔλεος*).

8. *Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God.* The LXX of Deut. xxxii. 43, a verse we have already quoted in connexion with Matt. iv. 11, concludes thus: "The Lord will make the land of his people pure" (*ἐκκαθαριεῖ Κύριος τὴν γῆν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*).

9. *Blessed are the peacemakers* (*οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί*); *for they shall be called sons of God.* There was one exception to the ruthless severity of the Hebrew invaders, when "Joshua made peace with them (i.e. the Gibeonites—*ἐποίησεν Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰρήνην*), and made a covenant with them to let them live" (Josh. ix. 15).

10. I have nothing to suggest for this verse.

Who is responsible for such O.T. allusions as we have discovered? They differ completely in character from the formal fulfilments of prophecy found in the special matter of the First Gospel. The Temptation narrative and the Beatitudes, pretty much as they stand in Matthew, are recognized as going back to Q. In so far as the reminiscences depend on details of the Greek version which are not found in the Hebrew, we must assign their origin to the period when translations of the Logia were being made into Greek and "each one interpreted them as he could," no doubt with the help of much reflection on the hidden meaning of the Scriptures.* But something remains which must have been in the original Aramaic reports of Our Lord's words. The Temptation narrative is generally considered to go back to Jesus Himself, who in this symbolic form told the disciples about His inner struggles. Sufficient has been said above to make it probable that the struggle turned not so much upon the conduct of the Messiah, in the generally accepted sense of the term, as upon that of the prophet like unto Moses. I do not think it too bold a speculation to suggest that Jesus took with Him into the wilderness, for spiritual reading during the "retreat," a roll of the Law containing Deuteronomy.† As regards the Beatitudes, I do not think there is more than unconscious reminiscence, due to years of meditation from the dawn of reflection, of passages connected with His great namesake Joshua. No such cause is likely to have operated upon the minds of the early Christians—the reminiscences are too subtle. We have, then, reason for thinking that in Matthew's version of the Beatitudes we have, practically, the *ipsissima uerba* of Jesus.‡

Two references from Josephus show that the Messiah could be looked upon as a Joshua *redivivus*.

(*a*) *Ant.* XX. v. 1. "Theudas persuaded a great part of the people to take their effects with them and follow him to the river Jordan; for he told them he was a prophet, and that he would, by his own command, divide the river, and afford them an easy passage over it." *Cf.* Josh. iii.; Acts v. 36.

(*b*) *Ant.* XX. viii. 6. The prophet from Egypt "advised the multitude of the common people to go along with him to the Mount of Olives. . . . He would show them from thence how at his command the walls of Jerusalem would fall down." *Cf.* Josh. vi.; Acts xxi. 38.

W. K. L. Clarke.

* Perhaps we should allow for the possibility of the Greek version having influenced the interpretation of the Hebrew text, and even for the current Hebrew text having been nearer the LXX than our printed text is.

† *Cf.* Luke iv. 17 *f.*, where He reads the Hebrew and then expounds the passage in the vernacular.

‡ Dr. E. C. Selwyn in *The Oracles of God* follows a line of thought similar to that found in this article. The book is not judicial, and is in my opinion largely wrong, but its subtlety and originality give it great value. It is one of those books from whose very mistakes, inseparable from a pioneer work, one learns more than from others' repetition of correct opinions.

Note.—Justin Martyr, who as a Palestinian belonged to the same circle (at a late date) as those for whom the First Gospel was written, would not have thought this argument fanciful. See his *Dialogue with Trypho*, c. 113, where he lays great stress on the son of Nun's name having been changed to Jesus. He alone of his contemporaries entered the Promised Land. As Jesus the Son of Nun distributed the good land to those who entered, so Jesus the Christ will distribute the spiritual land to His people. Joshua-ben-nun in Aramaic and New Hebrew = Joshua son of fish, i.e., in Semitic idiom, the Fish. Is not the title of Fish for our Lord, as in early Christian Art, evidence for the identification of Jesus with Joshua? The literary explanation, that it is derived from the first letters of *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτήρ*, is an obvious afterthought.

STOIC ELEMENTS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

I HAVE been charged with attributing to St. Paul, in my book *The One Body and the One Spirit*, too much knowledge of Stoicism. It has been pointed out to me that, though born at Tarsus, he was probably not educated there; for it seems from his own account of himself that he was brought up from childhood in the rabbinical schools at Jerusalem. That is true; but we must remember that after his conversion he spent some years at Tarsus, and there he was in the very focus of Stoic teaching. Apart from this, it was hardly possible in his day to avoid an acquaintance with Stoic physics. They were as current then as theories of evolution are now, and we know how people chatter about evolution with a very slender scientific equipment.

The belief, firmly rooted in Christian thought from the beginning, that the world will be destroyed by fire at the end of the *αἰὼν* is so far identical with the Stoic doctrine of *ἐκπύρωσις* at the end of the Great Year. It does not follow that the belief was derived from Stoicism, for it is a question whether this doctrine was not one of the contributions gathered by the Stoics from Oriental traditions or modes of thought, fused by them with the speculations of Heraclitus. But *ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ* (Matt. xix. 28) does seem to be an echo of specifically Stoic language—*ἐκπύρωσις καὶ παλιγγενεσία*—and so, less certainly, *οὐρανὸν καινὸν καὶ γῆν καινὴν* in Apoc. xxi. 1.

The differences which ensue are immense. The Stoic *ἐκπύρωσις* was utter destruction, the resolution of the whole Cosmos, including the Cosmic Spirit, into elemental fire. Nothing was permanent, nothing eternal, except *ἀναγκὴ* and that elemental fire, out of which *ἀναγκὴ* would proceed to create a new Cosmos. This would be wholly new; the *παλιγγενεσία* would retain or bring back nothing of the old. The Christian idea substitutes for *ἀναγκὴ* the transcendent Creator, the Lord sitting above the waterflood and remaining a king for ever; the *παλιγγενεσία* will gather out of the perishing world a remnant saved and purged by the fire.

My own impression is that St. Paul was fairly well read in the Stoic literature. He seems to have made much use of it, in thought and in language. If St. Luke correctly caught the spirit of his address to the people at Lystra, he used as the basis of his teaching quite good Stoicism, no doubt with amplifications and corrections to follow. I think that he talked Stoicism at Athens. But did he really quote *τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν* from the astronomical poem of Aratus? If he did, the question of his extended reading seems to be settled. The stock quotation, likely to be on the lips of anyone, would be *ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν* from the hymn of Cleanthes, perhaps the most popular of the Stoic writings, which Aratus imitated. I suppose, therefore, that he deliberately talked Stoicism at Athens, but found himself no match for the professional philosophers; for which reason he came to Corinth, as he afterwards said, "in weakness and in fear and in much trembling," resolved to have done with philosophy, and to establish his teaching "not in the wisdom of men but in the power of God." But four or five years later, recalling this, he said that he had a philosophy for those who were fully taught, *τοῖς τελείοις*, but a philosophy, "not of this *αἰὼν*, or of its authorities, who," on their own showing, "are being brought to nothing." It is, as suggested by the word *τελείοις*, a philosophy *ἐν μυστηρίῳ*, of which those authorities know

nothing. And so, he adds, "we have received, not τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου" —the Stoic πνεῦμα—"but τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ," the Spirit proceeding from the transcendent God, ignored or rejected in the current Stoicism. So I see him putting aside the philosophy which he had found inadequate, and yet using the *clichés* of it, as he continued to do, for the expression of his deeper thought in terms familiar to his contemporaries. Is it not in the same way that we use expressions borrowed from familiar theories of evolution? We acknowledge what is true in them, while transcending their limitations.

T. A. Lacey.

A NEW HYMN-BOOK*

(Communicated)

The appearance of a new hymn-book is an event of real importance in the life of the Church, for it is hardly possible to exaggerate the influence that is exercised by the hymns that we sing in public worship. Dissatisfaction with many of those now frequently used is not uncommon, especially among young and thoughtful people. It is they, above all, who will find *Songs of Praise* most congenial. Mr. Gladstone once remarked that the order proper to reviewing is to touch upon the weakness first, and then to praise where praise is due. I find very little to criticize in this book. No special place has been afforded "Home Missions." Perhaps the reason is that a small collection of hymns is invariably adopted for use at missions. There are many here, like Faber's "There's a wideness in God's mercy," and Howe's "Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord," that are suitable for use on such occasions, and it is arguable that it is better for them to be distributed in such a way as to encourage their use at ordinary services. Some of the words are a little stiff, and not very singable—*e.g.*, Robert Browning's—

> "Then welcome each rebuff
> That turns earth's smoothness rough,"

and Thomas Hardy's—

> "To thee whose eye all nature owns,
> Who hurlest dynasts from their thrones."

Among the children's it is good to see "We are but little children weak" omitted, but I regret the absence of "There's a friend for little children," for although it is open to some criticism it is extraordinarily effective. It was an excellent idea to bring animals within the orbit of the child's thoughts at worship, but what James Stephens has written is less a hymn than an excellent poem. There are fewer discoveries than I had expected in the section for small children, and it is here that they are especially needed. We have heaps of hymns about children, but very few that are written from the child's point of view. I should like to see a few hymns by children for children. My own children's school magazines encourage me to believe that such a thing is quite possible. Improvement upon existing hymn-books is nowhere more marked than in the "Commemoration and Funerals" section. There is an entire absence of that morbid element that has long afflicted us. Richard Baxter's—

> "Christ who knows all His sheep
> Will all in safety keep,
> He will not lose one soul,
> Nor ever fail us";

---

* *Songs of Praise*, published by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press.

and Henry Vaughan's "They are all gone into the world of light!" are precious additions to familiar hymnology.

We come, then, to the undoubted merits of *Songs of Praise*. The editor of the words, Dr. Percy Dearmer, has shown greater courage and better judgment than any compiler of hymns that is known to me. We have here the finest display of poetry that has ever graced a hymn-book. The treasures are drawn from a much more extensive field than is usually explored for this purpose, as will be seen from the following list of authors: Spenser, Shakespeare, Baxter, Milton, Blake, Shelley, Wordsworth, Browning, Tennyson, Bridges, Kipling, Masefield, Francis Thompson, Housman. Here, too, is Bunyan's famous shepherd song:

> "He that is down need fear no fall,
> He that is low no pride;
> He that is humble ever shall
> Have God to be his guide";

and Gascoigne's—

> "The little birds which sing so sweet
> Are like the angels' voice,
> Which render God His praises meet,
> And teach us to rejoice";

and Whittier's—

> "O brother man, fold to thy heart thy brother";

and Spring Rice's—

> "I vow to thee, my country—all earthly things above—
> Entire and whole and perfect, the service of my love."

The book is rich in poems it is a pleasure to take up and read, for they satisfy even without the aid of music. This is something of a novelty in hymns, for in them especially the French saying has found justification: "What is not worth saying is sung." In almost all other hymn-books there are a number that have little or nothing to recommend them except their mechanical regularity of accent. Good poetry like that in *Songs of Praise* inevitably demands an occasional modification in this respect, but this does not necessarily render it unsuitable for hymn-singing, provided the rhythm is intact. Excellent examples of this are to be found in "For all the saints" as set by Dr. Vaughan Williams, and "In the bleak mid-winter" as set by Holst. Congregations soon learn to sing these correctly and with enthusiasm, and hardly notice that they occasionally change the place of an accent, just as the old Welsh carol and ballad singers would spontaneously adapt their melodies to suit the sense of the words.

A novel feature appears in the collection of doxologies and acts of praise at the end, which will be especially useful at lectures and public meetings.

Theologically the book is thoroughly sound. A large proportion of the hymns have for their theme the Fatherhood of God, the Jesus of history, the Kingdom of God as a practical reality; and not a few are expressive of faith in the presence and power of the Holy Spirit. The list of authors shows that the compiler has wisely chosen his treasures from among divers denominations. This is not to say that on the doctrinal side *Songs of Praise* is vague and weak; on the contrary, what it does is to testify to the large measure of definite faith that all reasonable Christians hold in common. I would especially commend Part III.—"The Communion of

Saints "—which expresses better than any other collection of hymns what we nearly all feel to-day on this subject. We are not here specially concerned with the music. The fact that it is edited by Dr. Vaughan Williams and Mr. Martin Shaw is a sufficient guarantee that those feeble and gushing tunes which have long afflicted us are here superseded by robust melodies and strong harmonies. Bach comes into his own, so also do many of the old Celtic tunes.

A common defect in hymn books of the past has been their lack of the joyous spirit of worship. There has been so much begging and whining, so little giving and adoring. *Songs of Praise* is true to its title. It may take some time to win its way into popularity; it is not designed to evade this risk; but win its way it surely will, and I would hazard that our children will welcome it even more than we do. *Songs of Praise* is the book for the rising generation.

R. E. Roberts.

REVIEW

THE FOURTH EVANGELIST. By C. F. Nolloth. John Murray. 12s. 6d.

Dr. Nolloth tells us in his preface that his book on the Fourth Gospel found its occasion in a "kindly review" of his former work, *The Rise of the Christian Religion: a Study in Origins*, 1917, in which the reviewer "demurred to his attitude to the Johannine literature." Much of the present book is a restatement, most of it on the usual lines, of the evidence in favour of the traditional view of authorship. Dr. Nolloth's work puts before us once more the main facts of evidence, external and internal; and his interpretation of them is that of a scholar who not only knows his own mind, but the views of his opponents also. But it may be doubted whether his arguments will convince any who are not already of his way of thinking. The evidence is always measured and interpreted by that standard, in ways which leave us doubtful whether the reasonableness of other points of view is adequately realized.

In answer to the objection that the question of authorship is, after all, quite a minor point, we are told that "authorship and *genuineness* are in most cases too closely connected to allow us to be indifferent as to whose hand we owe the writings in question." How does the question of genuineness affect the problem of the Fourth Gospel, which nowhere claims to be the work of the Apostle John, or of any particular person* ?

The following statement (Introd., p. 7) cannot be regarded as a happy way of approaching the subject: "With one exception (the *Alogi*) the whole Church in every quarter *down to the death of Origen*† regarded the Johannine writings as the work of the younger son of Zebedee, the Apostle John. No other claimant to the authorship had either appeared or been suggested. Everyone concurred in assigning them to a primitive apostle who was still living when Trajan mounted the imperial throne. This argument is the more remarkable from the fact that it was not immediately arrived at: people who had not been in contact with the author hesitated." What are we to make of this ? The whole Church down to the death of Origen regarded all the five books as the work of the son of Zebedee. But at some time or other, in that period, "people who had not been in contact with the author hesitated" about the most important of them, the Gospel !

The truth, of course, is that until the time of Origen, or

* Except, of course, in the Appendix (c. xxi.), if we *assume* that the Beloved Disciple is the Apostle John.

† Throughout the italics are mine.

thereabouts, we know nothing about Christian opinion as to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel by the son of Zebedee. Theophilus of Antioch (A.D. 180) is the first writer who definitely connects the Gospel with the name of John. He does not call the John who wrote it Apostle, whatever he may have thought about the matter. Polycrates gives us an account of John, the Beloved Disciple, but does not give him the precedence we should expect to find given to the son of Zebedee. We can, of course, interpret the evidence of the last quarter of the second century as expressing the heritage of earlier times, and *assume* that the opinions held then were also held as generally in the first or second quarter of the century, or at any other date in the early history of the Church; and we are justified in laying stress on the absence of adverse testimony, if, but only if, we make it clear that the real state of the case is absence of any early testimony at all. And if we do so we are bound to give full weight to the apologetic character of many of the statements about the Gospel which came to us from the later period, the traces of other usage in Irenæus and others in connection with John, who is generally described as Elder or Disciple of the Lord, and not as Apostle, in those writers who certainly held that the Gospel was written by the son of Zebedee, the improbability of the survival of evidence which contradicted the view almost universally held from that time onwards, and the tendency to find everything of early date "Apostolic," which students of early Christian history cannot fail to notice in the literature of the latter part of the second century. Such considerations suggest that the *hesitation* which Dr. Nolloth mentions has more serious significance than his general argument allows. Real progress in the study of the Fourth Gospel will lie in fuller and more sympathetic consideration of the historical value of certain elements in the Fourth Gospel, and more serious attempts to weigh their evidence in connection with that of Synoptic tradition, rather than in restatement of the arguments for or against apostolic authorship; or further suggestions about the exact character and extent of the share of John the son of Zebedee in the making of the Spiritual Gospel as we have received it.

But Dr. Nolloth's book, though it will probably convince no one not already convinced on the question of authorship, is useful as a reminder that critical as well as orthodox tradition needs constant revision in the progress of the quest of the Historical Jesus.

A reviewer is bound to protest against one sentence at least (to be found on p. 198), which suggests want of care in dealing with the statements of others, though it should not be taken as typical of Dr. Nolloth's way with opponents. "What are

we to say of the contention that *accuracy of detail* is the mark of legendary, apocryphal, writing rather than of actual knowledge? Can bias appear more plainly?" A note gives a reference to Bacon, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 337. On referring to that passage one finds, of course, that the point at issue is "the introduction of names and details," which Drummond had stated to be "quite in accordance with the usage of apocryphal composition." The "introduction of detail" is not quite the same thing as "accuracy of detail." A few sentences later on (Nolloth, p. 199) we read the following sentences: "A theory has been formed. The contents of the Gospel, if they are to pass muster, must accord with it. There is no question of shaping the theory to the facts. The theory is the criterion of judgment. It is so much the worse for the Gospel narrative if it does not conform to it." Are Dr. Nolloth's own methods of handling disputed questions sometimes in danger of the judgment which he here passes on his critical opponents?

But let us end with another quotation, which strikes a different note, in which we can all concur (Preface, p. vi.): "It is being increasingly admitted that, more than any other book of the New Testament, this Gospel brings us into the very presence of our Lord." When we all realize that, we need not always be disputing whether He "spoke it on earth" or speaks it from heaven: especially if we remember that "speaking from heaven" is not a process of dictation. What He speaks, even so, is not always exactly what the disciple has written down, as he has heard and interpreted it, that men may believe, and have life in believing.

A. E. Brooke.

NOTICES

Israel and Babylon. By W. Lansdell Wardle. Holborn Publishing House.

For more than half a century we have been viewing the Old Testament in the light of the Ancient East. But even before that period scholars tried to visualize the life of the people of Israel by studying the life of modern Arabs; by comparing the religious conceptions contained in the Old Testament writings with the records which the classical writers have handed down to us concerning the Babylonians and Phœnicians; and also by comparing the historical data from the times of the Persian Kings with the later portion of the Old Testament. What was epoch-making in the *new* method, what forced us to reconstruct our whole idea concerning the Hebrews, was the fact that we had obtained clear historical knowledge of times so far back that even legend did not reach them.

The picture which unfolded itself before our eyes became ever more wonderful and complex in its colours. The powerful Assyrio-Babylonian civilization which surrounded the peoples of Western Asia formed the

frame. In this group-picture in which the life of the Ancient East was portrayed figured also the people of Israel; in many respects resembling their surroundings, in many others showing individual characteristics.

When Grotenfend found the key to the Assyrio-Babylonian cuneiform texts we became more and more acquainted with this whole circle of culture, and also with its mighty influence on the whole contemporary world. While the natural inclination of the Assyrians and Babylonians and the natural conditions of their country drew them out of their own frontiers and thus brought them into contact with the civilization of other nations, the Egyptian influences can only be detected at certain periods. Their chief characteristic was a conservative inclination to remain within their own boundaries, and to guard against the invasion of all foreign influences. Together with the Babylonians and Egyptians other nations crept out of the dim twilight of forgetfulness into the light of present-day research. Outstanding among these I may mention the Sumerians, upon whose culture that of the Assyrio-Babylonians was constructed.

The civilization of the Hittites, with which until lately we were only vaguely acquainted through the Bible, is now groping its way into the light.

The South-Arabian inscriptions, of which most are still undeciphered, guide us to the time and place where Moses led his people through the wilderness.

We are able to read Moabitic, Phœnician, and Aramaic inscriptions, not to speak of those appertaining to the many smaller nations which we came to know of through the war-records of the Assyrian and Egyptian kings. These discoveries brought forth a new problem for Biblical scholars, a problem expressed in the words " Babel and Bible."

We know how the world was startled twenty-three years ago when the late Professor Friedrich Delitzsch delivered his two lectures, bearing the above title, in the presence of the ex-Kaiser. We also know what an enormous literature those lectures produced on both sides of the controversy.

A new book on this subject may be one of two kinds—namely, creative, to which small class Adolf Jeremias's last edition of *Das A. T. im Lichte des A. O.* (of which edition, by the way, the author seems not to have known), Gunkel's, Gressman's, and Sellin's studies on Old Testament eschatology in the light of Babylonian religion, are conspicuous examples—or reproductive. Wardle's book belongs to the latter type. In about 350 pages he discusses in a lucid and popular manner the origins of Hebrew monotheism, the Creation stories, Paradise and the Fall, the Ante-Diluvians, the Deluge, Sabbath, and Jahweh, Legislation in Israel and in the code of Hammurabi, and Pan-Babylonism.

Whilst the present reviewer agrees with the general conclusion of the author that the spirit which hovers over the Old Testament scriptures is an absolutely different one from that which we find in the literary documents of the other Western-Asiatic nations, yet he cannot say that full justice has been done to the theme.

A book which claims to supply the " ordinary student or minister who has not access to a large library " with a *comprehensive* view of the problem, should exhibit fully and clearly the different theories, with the arguments by which they are supported or confuted, and the consequences that follow from them, and not merely give some scattered observations.

One example of the sins of omission in this respect must suffice. In the chapter on Legislation the author does not even mention the remarkable fact that the two Deuteronomic laws (Deut. xxi. 15-22), which are missing in the Book of Covenant, and the combination of which does not lie in the nature of things, are found in the exact order in the Code of Hammurabi.

Two inexplicable omissions must especially be noted: (*a*) a comparison between the Israelitish and Babylonian ideas of Revelation; (*b*) eschatology.

PAUL P. LEVERTOFF.

JESUS AMONG THE CHILDREN. By C. S. Woodward. Hodder and Stoughton. 5s.

THROUGH HUMAN EYES. By F. C. Williams. Longmans. 2s. 6d.

These two books have the same object—to make the earthly life of our Blessed Lord real and vivid to modern readers. The one is addressed to children; the other to adults. They are as successful as any such "reconstruction" can be. Canon Woodward has wisely, we think, made no attempt at archaic language; Mr. Williams has, and, on the whole, with good results, though certain expressions like "this appetizing dinner" (p. 41) mar the general effect. Perhaps the most valuable part of Canon Woodward's book is the Introduction in three chapters, dealing with the difficulties of the ordinary children's service and the way to meet them. In the narrative itself he sometimes lets his imagination run away with him; as, for instance, when he makes St. Mark's father one of his characters. The New Testament distinctly implies that his mother was a widow. Mr. Williams has a suggestive chapter which he calls the Diary of Judas Iscariot. This, and the first chapter, form the most original and striking parts of his book. In his seventh chapter he makes St. Mary Magdalene the ἁμαρτωλός of St. Luke vii. 36 *ff.*, surely without any justification. The κόφινος of the miracle of feeding the 5,000 are not "large" baskets (p. 49) but hand-baskets, such as the Jews used for their food. But these are small points. The books are reverently written and serve their purpose well. If they have not altogether escaped the danger of obscuring the truth that our Lord was very God as well as very Man, that is perhaps not to be wondered at in the case of works which aim at presenting His earthly life as it appeared to His contemporaries.

H. W. FULFORD.

TRIUMPHANT GOODNESS. By J. S. Hastie, B.D. Allenson. 5s.

This book is an impassioned eulogy of "goodness," though we are left in some doubt as to what precisely the author means by the word. "The simple fact of goodness," he says, "forms a way of escape from the perplexities and difficulties which face us to-day. Christ, the supreme goodness, demands goodness from us and makes His goodness possible to us. Goodness can conquer violence, avarice, and the natural reason. The Bible is the textbook of goodness. The Church (for Christ certainly came to found a Church) is, or should be, the teacher of goodness." The book is interesting from the earnestness with which it is written and the strong conviction of the writer. But it is unsatisfying. Mr. Hastie considers that the inner meaning of Christianity is simple, and finds that the "atmosphere and emphasis" even of the Apostle's Creed are in conflict

with what we find in the Synoptic Gospels. It may be questioned whether such a creedless Faith as he seems to desiderate would be sufficient to regenerate humanity or to overcome human weakness. He quotes with enthusiasm Mr. Booth's dying message, "Make the people good." To that we should all assent. But the question comes, How is this to be achieved? And to this question Mr. Hastie gives no very definite answer.

H. W. FULFORD.

THE CATHEDRAL CHURCHES OF ENGLAND. By A. Hamilton Thompson. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

We heartily welcome this book as supplying just the kind of expert guidance which is needed at a time when our cathedral foundations are being made the subject of a fresh scrutiny, with a view to the more effective discharge of their functions. It deals not only with the architectural history of the fabrics, but with the institutions connected with them, the place which they have filled in the life of the Church, and the transformations which they have undergone in the course of ages. The history is brought down to the present day and takes account of the cathedrals of recent foundation.

The author starts with the conception of the cathedral as the bishop's own church, with which he was closely associated, and round which there gathered a body of clergy intimately connected with him in the care of his flock. This conception was found in our earliest cathedrals at Canterbury, London, and Rochester.

Under the influence of the "monastic" and "secular" ideals there emerged the two types of cathedral foundation which survive to-day under the names of the New and the Old Foundations. If Dr. Hamilton Thompson lays the greater stress on the latter, it is because the monastic cathedrals shared in the common life and customs of other monastic churches, while the "secular" cathedrals conformed to the pattern of the Norman cathedrals (*e.g.*, Bayeux) which had remained free from monastic influence.

In the monastic cathedrals, which were under the rule of a prior, the bishop came to be regarded as a kind of "honorary abbot" of a community with which he had otherwise little to do. In the "secular" foundations in their earlier stages, though the Dean was elected by the Chapter, the members of the Chapter were appointed by the Bishop, and were his privy council, chosen to aid him in the work of the diocese. The bishop himself was a Canon of the church and held a prebend, which entitled him to sit in chapter and share in the daily recitation of the psalter. This earlier ideal became obscured by the growing independence of Deans and Chapters, by the enforced absence of bishops from their cathedral cities, and by the intrusion on the part of Crown and Papacy of their nominees with the richer prebends. The result was that the cathedral became a close corporation, jealous of its rights, and seeking to limit the power of the bishop in his own church.

Another matter on which light is thrown is the distinction between resident and non-resident canons, which has become stereotyped by the changes made at the Reformation and in Victorian days. The offices of dean, precentor, chancellor, and treasurer involved duties which required continual residence, but in theory every canon had a right to reside, and

if non-resident he had to appoint a Vicar to represent him in choir. Residence, however, was a costly affair both in time and money, and the exacting conditions involved in the "greater" and "lesser residences" deterred many, the result being that the administration passed into the hands of a small body of resident canons.

These are but a few examples of the many interesting subjects discussed in the book. Other chapters deal with the records of cathedral building, the internal arrangements and furniture, the cathedral close and its inhabitants, and the daily life in church and close, with its round of worship and hospitality.

J. H. Srawley.

Landmarks in the Struggle between Science and Religion. By J. Y. Simpson. Hodder and Stoughton. 7s. 6d.

The subject with which the author concerns himself demands knowledge of the science of the past and of the science of the present. With the latter it is quite obvious that Dr. Simpson possesses a wide acquaintance, and indeed the freshest parts of his book provide us with real insight on such matters as the conception of natural law. We have travelled far from the days when a Huxley or a Tyndall could assure us of the finality and the universality of the laws of science. To-day scientists on all sides assure us that for a world like our own the laws of science are rough statistical averages. For the world of the infinitely small, the molecule, and for the world of the infinitely grand, the planet, the laws of science break down. We heartily wish that it were in our power to praise the main portion of this interesting book, but we by no means feel that we can do so. The author has plainly done his best to write his chapters on the science of the past, but his equipment is not at all ample. There is a fair account of the classical contributions to science, but the review of the Fathers is not adequate. Aristotle's view of the development of life ultimately led to the correct interpretation of the Mosaic account of the creation, and his view St. Augustine cordially adopted. Indeed, if the teaching of the African Father, in this respect at least, had remained the teaching of the Church, the triumph of the theory of evolution might have been anticipated by fourteen centuries. St. Augustine was an observer; Aristotle was a scientific observer. The latter distinguished no fewer than five hundred species of mammals, birds, and fishes. Underlying these and other species he conceived of a single chain of events, which is among the greatest of his achievements; it completely passed out of the ken of man till the middle of the nineteenth century. St. Augustine rejected the doctrine of special creation, and the Church rejected it till the days of John Milton, whose "Paradise Lost" was the cause of its reception. Huxley fondly believed that Moses wrote "Trespassers will be prosecuted" across the path of the naturalist. He was wrong. It was John Milton who affixed this notice. Will the pleasure his poems have given atone for the pain of such a conception as special creation? For hundreds of years the Church entertained no such idea, yet the genius of one man was enough to plant it in the heart of Europe. It is, we hope, evident that the author has given us a thought-provoking piece of work.

R. H. Murray.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. With Introduction and Notes (*The Indian Church Commentaries*). By Lawrence E. Browne, B.D., Bishop's College, Calcutta. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Mr. Browne's commentary is intended in the first instance for the use of Indians, Christian and non-Christian. Of its suitability for this purpose we are hardly competent to judge. But on its merits it deserves a far wider circulation, and should be most useful to many in this country. It is an admirable piece of work. The writer combines scholarship and a first-hand knowledge of modern critical literature, both English and German, with missionary interest and experience. Many illustrations, as we should expect, are drawn from Indian life and religion. We rightly look to the conditions of the mission field to-day to throw light on similar conditions in the early Christian Church. The limits of the work forbid any detailed discussion of critical problems. We consider that the author underestimates the difficulties of dating the book at the close of the two years of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome. And many points of scholarship and interpretation are necessarily passed over. But the general line of treatment shows both knowledge and judgment. Difficulties are not shirked. The discussion of such a question as the miraculous is both frank and reverent. We know of no book dealing with the New Testament which we would more willingly put into the hands of readers of some education who are perplexed by modern methods of interpreting the Bible, but do not want to be distracted by a too detailed commentary. The author combines a missionary and evangelical Christianity with modern knowledge. Others again would find it a useful companion to a more minute and critical study, such as that to be found in the Clarendon Bible. We hope that this work will have the circulation that it deserves.

E. J. BICKNELL.

PUNISHMENT, HUMAN AND DIVINE. By W. C. de Pauley, B.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, St. John's College, Winnipeg. S.P.C.K. 1925. 7s. 6d.

This book raises the hope that the Church overseas may yet provide a home for the "sound learning" which is being starved out of the Church of England. It is an accurate and careful piece of work, based on wide reading and thoroughly Christian in outlook. A study of five representative writers leads up to the main thesis, that "punishment is a combination of three mutually interdependent elements, the retributive, the reformative, and the deterrent." The book is not easy reading. It is far too full of quotations, though, in dealing with this subject, it is strange to find among them none from the writings of the late Dr. Moberly. We sometimes wish that the writer had given more space to the development of his own views in his own words. Many pages, for instance, are given to a condensed and necessarily obscure summary of the world scheme of Plotinus, which bears little relation to the problem of punishment as it faces the ordinary man. On the other hand, we miss any attempt to discuss the urgent problem that God seems to permit suffering which overwhelms guilty and innocent alike. And the book leaves off with a curious abruptness. But Professor de Pauley has given us a book which is worth the effort of studying, and we hope that its reception will encourage him to persevere in the pursuit of "sound learning."

E. J. BICKNELL.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD. GUILDFORD AND ESHER.